

California until such time as they can be replaced; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2722. By Mr. LYNCH: Resolution of the Italian-American Labor Council of New York City, opposing the Smith bill, the Hobbs bill, and all other antilabor bills introduced in Congress; to the Committee on Labor.

2723. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the Brotherhood of Teamsters and Auto Truck Drivers, Local No. 85, International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Stablemen, and Helpers of America, San Francisco, Calif., relative of House bill 6486, postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2724. By Mr. WOLCOTT: Petition of 20 members of the World Service Society of Westminster Presbyterian Church, Port Huron, Mich., urging that strikes and profiteering be outlawed during the war; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

TUESDAY, APRIL 28, 1942

(Legislative day of Monday, March 30, 1942)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, The Very Reverend Zebarny T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God and Heavenly Father, hope of every nation, whose infinite pity alone can soothe the tragic pathos of our world: Help us, Thy children, to rise above all fret and fear into the atmosphere of serenity and calm, as, casting all our care upon Thee, we feel the girding of Thine everlasting arms. Grant to us a clearer vision of the truth, a deeper sense of right, that will enable us, through Thine overwhelming power of goodness, to further the noblest interests of mankind.

Restore to every home in this beloved land the practice of parental tenderness, together with the spirit of filial devotion, that from the altars of life's highest, holiest relationships may rise a sacrificial flame of true devotion to the larger claims of service to our Nation. Help us, then, to face these days, just now so difficult and dark, with a courage born of perfect trust in Thee, with a faith made radiant with the hope of a world redeemed, in which men, as they journey on, shall take the hand of Him in whose companionship they find their full fruition, even Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, April 27, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had

disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4092) for the relief of E. P. Corley; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. McGEHEE, Mr. KEOGH, and Mr. WINTER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had severally agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 2192. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to reimburse Carol D. Ward for the losses sustained by him by reason of the negligence of an employee of the Civilian Conservation Corps;

H. R. 4657. An act for the relief of Floyd P. Moritzky;

H. R. 5887. An act for the relief of Howard L. Miller; and

H. R. 6328. An act for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States and for the settlement of individual claims approved by the War Department.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 6804. An act to amend paragraph 31 of section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended;

H. R. 6899. An act to exempt custodial employees of the District of Columbia Board of Education from the operation of the provisions of section 6 of the Legislative, Executive, and Judicial Appropriation Act approved May 10, 1916;

H. R. 6953. An act to amend the District of Columbia Income Tax Act, as amended, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 303. Joint resolution to codify and emphasize existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 2320. An act to accept the cession by the States of North Carolina and Tennessee of exclusive jurisdiction over the lands embraced within the Great Smoky Mountains National Park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5075. An act to create a Recreation Board for the District of Columbia, to define its duties, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6799. An act to increase the monthly maximum number of flying hours of air pilots, as limited by the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, because of the military needs arising out of the present war.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Brewster	Caraway
Andrews	Brooks	Chandler
Austin	Brown	Chavez
Bailey	Bulow	Clark, Idaho
Ball	Bunker	Clark, Mo.
Bankhead	Burton	Connally
Barkley	Butler	Danaher
Bilbo	Byrd	Davis
Bone	Capper	Downey

Doxey	McFarland	Shipstead
Ellender	McKellar	Smathers
George	McNary	Smith
Gerry	Maloney	Spencer
Gillette	Maybank	Stewart
Glass	Mead	Taft
Green	Millikin	Thomas, Idaho
Guffey	Murdock	Thomas, Okla.
Gurney	Murray	Thomas, Utah
Hayden	Norris	Tobey
Herring	Nye	Tunnell
Hill	O'Daniel	Tydings
Holman	O'Mahoney	Vandenberg
Hughes	Overton	Van Nuys
Johnson, Calif.	Pepper	Wagner
Johnson, Colo.	Radcliffe	Wallgren
Kilgore	Reed	Walsh
La Follette	Reyno'ds	White
Lee	Rosier	Wiley
Lucas	Russell	Willis
McCarran	Schwartz	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are necessarily absent.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent as a result of injury and illness.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, lists of papers and documents on the files of the Treasury (2), War, Justice, and Agriculture (7); and the Civil Service Commission, which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking toward their disposition, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by a mass meeting of Negroes at Jackson, Miss., protesting against racial discrimination in employment in connection with war industries in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WALSH:

A petition of sundry citizens of the State of Massachusetts, praying for retention of the 40-hour workweek provision of law; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A petition of sundry citizens of the State of Massachusetts, praying for continuance of the National Youth Administration program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Leavenworth (Kans.) Chamber of Commerce, favoring suspension of the 40-hour workweek provision of law for the duration of the war; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A petition, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of Miami County, Kans., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

RESOLUTION OF AGGIEVILLE GRANGE NO. 1906, MANHATTAN, KANS.—PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AROUND MILITARY CAMPS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present and have printed in the RECORD a resolution recently adopted by Aggieville Grange, No. 1906, of Manhattan, Kans., making some legislative suggestions which I consider timely and worthy.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AGGIEVILLE GRANGE, No. 1906,
Manhattan, Kans.

Since the liquor traffic has succeeded in establishing itself in and near the cantonments of our country to make drinkers of our draftees: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we ask Congress to pass a bill forbidding the sale of alcoholic liquors in and near the naval, land, and air forces of the United States of America.

In view of the fact that we are being rationed in sugar and asked to conserve our resources in every possible way that we may make the greatest contributions possible to the winning of the war, which we gladly do: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Congress be asked to restrict the use of all sugar and grain now being used in the manufacture of alcohol for beverage purposes.

A. R. COGSWELL, Master,
LOUISE CHANDLER, Secretary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

S. 2459. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act for the relief of present and former postmasters and acting postmasters, and for other purposes," to permit payment of total compensation to certain employees of the Postal Service employed in a dual capacity; without amendment (Rept. No. 1276).

By Mr. WALSH from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S. 2285. A bill to provide for the retirement, with advanced rank of certain officers of the Navy; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1277);

S. 2452. A bill to provide for the advancement on the retired list of certain officers of the United States Coast Guard; with amendments (Rept. No. 1278);

S. 2453. A bill to authorize the obligation of funds of the Coast Guard for work or material at Government-owned establishments, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1279);

S. 2455. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide additional pay for personnel of the United States Navy assigned to duty on submarines and to diving duty," to include additional pay for diving in depths of less than 90 feet under certain conditions, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1280);

S. 2456. A bill to amend the act approved February 4, 1919 (40 Stat. 1056), entitled "An act to provide for the award of medals of

honor, distinguished-service medals, and Navy crosses, and for other purposes," so as to change the conditions for the award of medals, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1281);

H. R. 6874. A bill to change the designation of the Bureau of Navigation of the Department of the Navy to the Bureau of Naval Personnel; without amendment (Rept. No. 1282);

H. R. 6913. A bill to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the seventy-sixth anniversary convention of the Grand Army of the Republic to be held at Indianapolis, Ind., September 13-18, inclusive, 1942; without amendment (Rept. No. 1283); and

H. R. 6932. A bill to establish the composition of the United States Navy, to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1284).

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

H. R. 4476. A bill providing for sundry matters affecting the Military Establishment; with amendments (Rept. No. 1285).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BAILEY:

S. 2489. A bill for the relief of C. A. Ragland, Sr.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 2490. A bill to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941 (Public Law 8, 77th Cong.), as amended by section 10 of the act entitled "An act to amend and clarify certain acts pertaining to the Coast Guard, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1941 (Public Law 166, 77th Cong.); to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY (for himself, Mr. BONE, and Mr. LA FOLLETTE):

S. 2491. A bill to amend the patent laws, to prevent suppression of inventions, to promote the progress of science and the useful arts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Patents.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 6804. An act to amend paragraph 31 of section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended;

H. R. 6899. An act to exempt custodial employees of the District of Columbia Board of Education from the operation of the provisions of section 6 of the Legislative, Executive, and Judicial Appropriation Act approved May 10, 1916; and

H. R. 6953. An act to amend the District of Columbia Income Tax Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. J. Res. 303. Joint resolution to codify and emphasize existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TAXES—ADDRESS BY HON. JOHN W. HANES

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject of taxes delivered by Hon. John W. Hanes, former Under Secretary of the Treasury, before the American Society of Newspaper Editors in New York on April 17, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

SPIRITUAL STRENGTH OUR GREATEST NEED

[Mr. BYRD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by 37 citizens of Virginia declaring that spiritual strength is the greatest need in the crisis which now confronts us, which appears in the Appendix.]

MAINTENANCE OF UNINTERRUPTED OPERATION OF DEFENSE INDUSTRIES

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the unanimous-consent agreement of the 20th instant, the question before the Senate at this time is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2054, the title of which will be stated by the clerk.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2054) relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants in the interests of the national defense.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senate very kindly and generously agreed by unanimous consent that this motion be in order this morning. As suggested a week ago, I withheld making the motion on the specific request of the President of the United States. In the meantime, the President has sent a message to Congress, and I understand he will make an address to the country over the radio tonight in which he will develop some aspects and phases of his message in a fuller degree.

I still adhere to the view that Senate bill 2054 is a desirable one, and should be enacted. However, it is not my disposition this morning to press for immediate consideration. As I understand, the bill will remain on the calendar, and my motion can be made at any time when I can obtain recognition. It is not my disposition to make the motion this morning for immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator wish to withdraw the motion?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I was about to suggest to the Senator that inasmuch as the motion was made the pending question he should withdraw it.

Mr. CONNALLY. I did not understand the motion was pending; I understood the unanimous-consent agreement was that it would be in order for me to make the motion this morning.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Consideration of the Senator's motion was postponed until today.

Mr. CONNALLY. I did not realize that the motion had actually been made. Under those circumstances, of course, I shall have to express my desire to withdraw the motion for the time being.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has a right to withdraw his motion.

Mr. TAFT rose.

Mr. CONNALLY. Before the motion is withdrawn I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, it seems to me to be vitally necessary that some labor legislation be enacted by the Congress. While I am not particularly strong for consideration of the Connally bill, I think it would be very unfortunate

to send out word to the country that the Senate has, in effect, indefinitely postponed consideration of the labor problem. I think we are going to be blamed, very properly and very strongly, if we take that attitude.

While I should not like to refuse unanimous consent to postpone the motion which is now the order of business before the Senate, it seems to me that it should be postponed to a day certain, if we are to hear from the President tonight, and that it should not be put off indefinitely but should come up some time early next week, perhaps on Monday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas has a right to withdraw the motion.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest to the Senator from Ohio that the action just indicated by the Senator from Texas is not to be construed, as I understand it, as a request for indefinite postponement of his motion. The bill is still on the calendar, and it will occupy the same status it now occupies. The Senator from Texas can make the motion at any time he thinks it advisable to proceed to the consideration of the bill. I think that no purpose would be served at this time by postponing the motion to another day certain, because of the situation which now exists in the production program, and in view of the address to be delivered by the President, and the attitude he assumes upon this subject.

I wish to congratulate the Senator from Texas for the broad-minded, generous, and patriotic attitude which he is assuming in regard to this matter. We all appreciate the Senator's sincerity, and we all appreciate the fact that he has had no selfish interest to serve, either in advocating the proposed legislation originally, in seeking its consideration by the Senate, or in pressing action in regard to it. Speaking for myself, and I think for a majority of the Members of the Senate, I congratulate the Senator from Texas upon his reasonable, generous, and, as I believe, proper attitude at this time regarding the proposal.

I take this occasion also to congratulate the Senator from Texas upon another matter. I do it wholeheartedly and most sincerely. All of us here have known for years the very charming, gracious, and beautiful lady who has yielded to the irresistible importunities of the Senator from Texas and has become his partner in holy matrimony. I wish for him and her long life and happiness and the enjoyment of everything that so handsome and worthy a couple ought to enjoy during the remainder of their lives.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am very grateful to the Senator from Kentucky for his fulsome eulogy of my beloved wife and the Senator from Texas. I am indeed grateful for his comments respecting my official as well as my private affairs.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I wish I had the wit and the facility to express my feelings in the way in which our leader has expressed his to the Senator from Texas with regard to both matters which have been before us today.

I thank the Senator from Texas for not pressing his motion at this time, and I wish to make a request of him, that since he has made the announcement that his bill will remain on the calendar and can be called up at any time, and since I think he knows—and if he does not know, I should like to inform him now—that as chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor I should like to speak against the motion when it comes before us; I should like to have some little notice so that I may be present, and may not be caught in an unexpected moment.

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall be very glad to give the Senator notice. I assure the Senator that I have no disposition to call up the motion without his having notice, and I recognize that, as chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, the Senator is entitled to every consideration in respect to the matter.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The Senator knows that it is reasonable for me to make the request, because he must know how hard it is to prepare an argument to resist a motion which he is to make.

Mr. CONNALLY. It is because of the merits of the motion, and not because of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. Am I to understand that the Senator from Texas has information that the President will enunciate a labor policy in his speech tonight, and for that reason the Senator is asking that his bill be deferred until that is done?

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Texas arrived back in the city only this morning, and has not had any intimate contact with the White House for several days.

I understand that the speech of the President tonight will at least elaborate a bit more fully some aspects of the program which he announced in his message. I do not have that information directly from the White House, but from sources which I think can be relied upon.

As to the details of any labor policy the President may present, I cannot, in all sincerity, give the Senator from Virginia any assurance. I understand the President did in his message deal with the matter of wage levels, and advanced the theory that possibly there should be a stabilization of wages, and a ceiling. Of course, that relates to labor, but as to the other aspects of the labor situation, I have to state to the Senator from Virginia that I have no information.

Mr. BYRD. My reason for making the inquiry is that a week ago the Senator from Texas asked for the postponement of the consideration of his bill because the President would present to Congress his views with respect to a labor program on the part of the Government. The message sent to the Congress yesterday had practically nothing in it with respect to any labor program which is different

from the one which has already been established by the administration.

I desired to ask the Senator from Texas whether he would be willing to defer consideration merely, leaving his bill as the pending business for consideration until the President shall make his speech tonight, and then let us decide tomorrow whether the matter should be deferred, because if the special order which the Senator from Texas now has for his bill shall be abandoned and the bill put back on the calendar, it will mean the death not only of his bill but perhaps of other labor legislation which may be desired to be brought before the Congress.

A number of Senators have informed the Senator from Texas from time to time that they propose to offer amendments to his bill, and have been cooperating with him in the effort to have his bill considered, and I think it is rather remarkable that the Senator from Texas should desire to withdraw his bill, in the sense that it will lose its preferred position, unless the President of the United States has in mind presenting to Congress some views in the immediate future with respect to the labor situation.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Virginia is mistaken in assuming that the bill now has a preferred status.

Mr. BYRD. It has a preferred status on the motion to ask for consideration.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; it is only in this status; the Senator from Texas moved to proceed to consider it, and that motion is pending. The bill is still on the calendar and will remain on the calendar if the motion is withdrawn, just as if it were not withdrawn.

Mr. BYRD. I read from the calendar for today:

SPECIAL ORDER, APRIL 28, 1942

Motion of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] to proceed to the consideration of S. 2054, a bill relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants in the interest of the national defense.

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. That certainly gives a preferred status in the sense that it requires us to proceed to a consideration of the legislation.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; it does not. It is merely a motion to consider.

Mr. BYRD. A motion to consider taking up the bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. A motion to consider it. The Senate must agree to a motion to consider a bill before it can be taken up in the Senate.

Mr. BYRD. But it at least loses its preferred status with respect to being a special order, whether the Senate will consider taking up the bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; it is not a preferred status. It does not lose anything. The Senator from Texas withdraws his motion to proceed now to consider the bill. He can renew that motion at any time he sees fit to do so.

Mr. BYRD. It loses its preferred status insofar as consideration of the bill at a specified time is concerned.

Mr. BARKLEY. Not at all. If the Senator would come in tomorrow and make a motion to proceed to consider that bill it would have the same status as it does now.

Mr. CONNALLY. Or if any other Senator would make the motion.

Mr. BARKLEY. Or if any other Senator would make the motion; yes.

Mr. BYRD. I should like to know for what reason the Senator from Texas has proposed to withdraw his motion, unless he has information that some labor policy or program is to be presented by the President. Why is the Senator not willing to proceed to the present consideration of his bill?

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall answer the Senator from Virginia. The Senator is in error when he said a moment ago that if this motion is not voted on today it will mean that this bill is dead, and all other labor legislation is dead. That is not true at all.

Mr. BYRD. Time will tell.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Virginia is fudging on time, because he is proceeding to tell what will happen, without waiting on time to tell.

Mr. BYRD. That is the judgment of the Senator from Virginia and the judgment of many other Members of this body.

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall say to the Senator from Virginia that I understand the parliamentary situation to be just as the Senator from Kentucky has stated it. This bill is on the calendar, in its regular place on the calendar. Whenever I, or the Senator from Virginia, if he desires, or any other Senator, gets the Chair to see him and recognize him, he can make a motion to proceed to the consideration of this bill, even if we were in the middle of the consideration of another bill. Is not such a motion always in order? Suppose we were considering one bill. While we were doing so the Senator could make a motion to proceed to the consideration of some other bill, which, if agreed to, would have the effect of laying the pending bill aside, and taking up the new bill. Am I not correct in that statement? I may be in error.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Texas is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Chair, and I thank the parliamentarian. [Laughter.] My reason for that remark is that the parliamentarian nodded to me before he had any conversation with anyone else. [Laughter.] I was sure that was the rule, having been here for some years.

I think the Senator from Virginia does not quite appreciate the attitude of the Senator from Texas. I do not believe the Senator from Virginia means to question the sincerity of the Senator from Texas. The Senator from Texas introduced in the Senate nearly a year ago, in June, a bill very much like this one, except that it did not freeze labor conditions. The Senate passed that bill, and it went to the House and was ignored.

I reintroduced the bill in November, I believe it was, or sometime last fall, with the freezing conditions in it. It went to the Judiciary Committee, when some

Senators thought I ought to have sent it to the Committee on Education and Labor. I meant no reflection on the Committee on Education and Labor, but I thought it was a bill which ought to go to the Judiciary Committee, because it related to the taking over and confiscation, in a limited sense, of plants, and I thought that since the Judiciary Committee had considered other legislation of a similar character it ought to consider this proposed legislation.

This was not done in any hasty manner. We proceeded in a regular way. We had a subcommittee appointed. We held long and exhaustive hearings. The Senator from Texas has never surrendered his views on the bill, and he does not surrender them now.

Mr. BYRD. Will the Senator from Texas—

Mr. CONNALLY. Just a moment. Let me make a few desultory remarks. [Laughter.] The Senator from Virginia ought to realize, though, that the Senator from Texas is the author of this bill, and is a Senator on this floor, and is a member of the administration, in a sense. We are trying to get along with this war. We are trying to have leadership. The President of the United States is not only the civil President, but he is the military Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy. He is charged with responsibility. We can make all the speeches we want to, but the President of the United States is charged, under the Constitution, with the responsibility of prosecuting this war. I do not want to be in the position of getting into a controversy and an argument with the President of the United States about something which may work out under his policies better than under somebody else's policies.

Mr. President, there are dozens of labor bills before the Senate. The Senator from Virginia says many Senators desire to present amendments to my bill. Of course, I know they wish to present amendments, and if the Senate were simply to consider my bill alone I do not think there would be any trouble in the Senate passing the bill. Senators have all sorts of amendments, and that is where arises the very difficulty which the Senator from Texas is now facing, and the very objections which the President of the United States probably has to this bill coming up now, because he knows that every sort of amendment, every imaginable kind of amendment is going to be offered, and we shall have a great deal of debate, endless debate, which will stir up a great deal of dissension.

That is the situation the Senator from Texas is in. I still believe in my bill, and I should like to see it enacted into law. But I have another duty to perform. I have the duty of trying to go along in this war effort. We had the testimony of Mr. Nelson a few days ago that we were over the hump as to production; that production matters were proceeding satisfactorily; that we were getting more ships, more planes, and more arms. We had the testimony, as I understand—I was not present at the time—of Judge Patterson from the War Department, in charge of production, along the same

line. We also had the testimony of Mr. Forrestal, of the Navy, along the same line.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, we had all that testimony before the Senator from Texas, on Monday, a week ago, agreed to bring his bill up this morning for consideration, that is to say, for decision as to whether the Senate would proceed with the consideration of it. I do not question the sincerity of my distinguished colleague in any way. I love him, and am devoted to him. I simply wanted to know what he has in mind now. Is the President going to send another message to Congress about labor? Does the Senator expect the President to elaborate tonight about a labor policy or program? If so, I am entirely willing to see the proposed legislation deferred. I simply wish to ask the Senator this question: So long as the President of the United States is opposed to the consideration of this bill, will the Senator then defer the consideration of it?

Mr. CONNALLY. I am not prepared to say that I will do that; no.

Mr. BYRD. What has happened since the Senator's motion, made a week ago, to change the situation?

Mr. CONNALLY. I will answer the Senator. The Senator now wants me to tell him what kind of statement the President is going to make tonight. Why does not the Senator call up the White House, or go there and talk to the President, take him by the hand, and find out? [Laughter.] I do not know what is going to be in the President's statement, in all frankness, having been out of the city for a few days. I have not been here; I have not had the opportunity the Senator from Virginia has had, since he has been right here in this city.

Mr. BYRD. On what basis and for what reasons is the Senator asking today that his bill not be considered under the pending special order which he worked diligently to obtain?

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Virginia has heard what the Senator from Texas said. He sits right next to me. The Senator from Virginia is not deaf. I am in a very difficult position, I will say to the Senator. The Senator knows that.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator was in a difficult position last week, Monday a week.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say that the Senator from Virginia has been making speeches here for a long time about this labor situation. I do not know if he has introduced any bill with respect to it. Has the Senator?

Mr. PYRD. I have submitted amendments to the bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. All right. The Senator from Texas is affording the Senator from Virginia the only opportunity he would ever get or ever have, for consideration of his amendments, if this motion is presented—and he can present it himself if he wants to. Yet the Senator from Virginia is complaining about the Senator from Texas.

Mr. BYRD. I am not complaining except I want the Senator to call his bill up for consideration.

Mr. CONNALLY. Why, the amendments of the Senator from Virginia, instead of having a marble tomb, would be sleeping under a plain wooden slab except for the opportunity the Senator from Texas gives him to have them considered in connection with his bill.

Mr. BYRD. But the Senator is not giving an opportunity for consideration of amendments, because he is not pressing his bill for consideration. This is a very vital situation which confronts the Senate. The country expects the proposed legislation to be taken up. The Senator from Texas has time and time again said he wants to take it up. What has happened in the last week to change the mind of the Senator? Has he received any information that a labor program is going to be presented, or what is the reason for his proposed action? The Senator stated a week ago last Monday he did not want the bill presented for consideration that day, because the President said he intended to present to the Congress—and the Senator from Texas said he had conferred with the President—a labor program. It has not been presented yet. I am asking the Senator what information has he today about it? It is very easy to ridicule those who have made a sincere effort to remedy this labor situation and strike situation. The Senator from Virginia may have been wrong in his effort to improve the armament production.

Mr. CONNALLY. Oh, no. I was not criticizing the Senator.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Virginia had made a conscientious effort to remove these interferences which have existed to production of armaments in this country.

Mr. CONNALLY. I shall say to the Senator from Virginia that I am not trying to ridicule him at all. I am simply remarking, however, that I am giving him the only opportunity he ever will get, and he ought to be helpful rather than hostile.

Mr. BYRD. Maybe this will not be the only opportunity, but it was the opportunity the Senate understood it was to get. I have discussed time and time again with the Senator that amendments were to be offered to the bill, and he was not opposed to those amendments to the bill; in fact, he appealed to those who were not in favor of the principle of his bill to support his bill because they would have the opportunity to offer amendments.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Texas told me that.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes; that is correct.

Mr. BYRD. I am not enthusiastic about this bill simply to seize plants. That does not settle the labor controversy which exists in this country. The Senator from Texas has said "You should support my bill because it will give you an opportunity then to offer amendments to it."

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD. So I do not think the Senator from Texas has a right to complain about the matter, because I have been entirely frank with him in connection with the whole procedure.

Mr. CONNALLY. Absolutely. Mr. President, I do not mean to criticize the

Senator from Virginia, but he has been going full blast and torpedoing me here right in the side. I still have nerves and I am sensitive to major attacks. I am not attacking the Senator from Virginia. I have tried to be frank with him.

Mr. BYRD. I want to ask the Senator—

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator from Virginia that, of course, the President of the United States has influence with me. I do not always vote with him, as the Senator from Virginia knows, but we are now in war, and he is the President, he is the Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy, and I am trying to help him, and I think he is going to try to help us. The President has not gone as far as I should like to see him go in these labor matters. I have been against strikes. The Senator from Virginia will probably recall that I spoke in his city on January 8, 1941. He will remember that I there and then publicly denounced strikes in munition plants, and said I was against them. He knows that I have proposed legislation from time to time. He knows that I have not changed my view at all. Mr. President, I have not changed my views at all on the subject. But there are other considerations, and others who are entitled to consideration, and I am trying to do the fair and the decent thing. If the Senator from Virginia does not like it, I cannot help it. I have told him all I know. I do not know whether the President is going to come out with a labor policy tonight or not. I hope he will make his position more clear. However, I cannot tell the Senator what he will say. If that does not satisfy the Senator, he will have to remain unsatisfied.

Mr. BYRD. Is the Senator willing to let his motion remain a special order of business and simply postpone consideration of it until tomorrow?

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not think that would serve the purpose very well. The President of the United States is going to speak to the country tonight. How can we know within a few hours what the country thinks? The people themselves will not know. I think we ought to give the President an opportunity to speak to the country and see what the reaction from the people of the United States is to be to his message and his policies.

After all, this Government belongs to the people back home. It does not belong to us. It belongs to the people of the United States. I do not pretend to know all there is to know about the labor question, I may be all wrong. I do not know. I do not think I am. The Senator from Virginia knows that there are a dozen different plans and a dozen different schools of thought as to how the labor problem ought to be met.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator says that the Government belongs to the people. He is absolutely correct. Does he not believe that the majority of the people of America want something done with regard to labor legislation?

Mr. CONNALLY. I think so. They want something; but even in the Senate there are about 40 different groups.

Mr. BYRD. Why is the Senator so afraid of bringing these matters before the Senate for full and frank discussion

and debate? He has never been afraid in the past.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am not afraid to bring them up.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator stated, as one of his objections to consideration of the bill at this time, that dozens of different plans would be offered to the Senate.

Mr. CONNALLY. One must not only have an inclination, he must have votes in the Senate. I want support for what I do. What good would it do to bring up something and get hell beat out of you? [Laughter.]

Mr. BYRD. If the Senator proceeds with his motion, I am sure the Senate will consider his bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is the Senator's thought. In the past I have known the Senator to have thoughts which were not fulfilled.

Mr. BYRD. That is correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. Just as all of us have.

Mr. BYRD. Will the Senator agree to defer consideration of his motion for 1 week, so that we may obtain the reaction from the country with respect to the President's address, and in order that his motion may retain its present position as a special order of business?

Mr. CONNALLY. I have had experience with deferring things for a week, and it has not always proved entirely satisfactory, as the Senator can see. My bill will remain on the calendar; and not only I, but any other Senator, may make a motion to proceed to take it up. If the Senator from Virginia wishes to make such a motion, he can do so.

Mr. BYRD. Suppose the Senator from Virginia should now make a motion to take it up, would the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] oppose it?

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not know. I presume he would.

Mr. BYRD. He would probably do the same thing at any time I might make a motion to take up the bill from the calendar.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator from Virginia knows that the Senate cannot be made to do something which a majority of Senators do not want to do. If the Senator from Kentucky can obtain more votes than can the Senator from Virginia on a motion or issue, the Senator from Virginia will get licked. I know the Senator knows that.

Mr. BYRD. Why does the Senator from Texas think that the Senate does not want to consider the proposed legislation?

Mr. CONNALLY. I think many Senators do. I know of many others who do not. I have been in contact with many Senators. I think that a great many of them who would vote to take up the bill would not like to do so today. I think Senators who would probably vote for it next week, or would have voted for it before this controversy arose, would say, "I am for the bill, but this is no time to bring it up. If it is brought up now, I will have to vote against it." The Senator knows that. He has been in politics a long time. He knows that every Senator must consider his associates and supporters.

I am trying to make the best possible disposition of this matter. If I withdraw the motion, the bill will still remain on the calendar. I may feel the inclination to make the motion at some future time, depending upon conditions and developments. However, I do not care to say that I intend to make it next Tuesday, because we might then have the same situation we now have. Any Senator may make the motion. I do not have to make it. Any Senator who can catch the eye of the Vice President—and he has two good eyes [laughter]—and can obtain the floor, can make a motion to proceed to the consideration of the bill; but, frankly, in the face of the present situation, with the President preparing to make a radio address tonight I do not care to press the matter and be apparently in an attitude of hostility to the President of the United States.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. GLASS. The distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] serves notice that he proposes to speak against the bill when it comes up. I wish to suggest to him that that is unnecessary. The Senator from Texas has done so beforehand.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator from Virginia. I shall not quarrel with him, even though he smite me. [Laughter.]

Does any other Senator wish to make a few remarks? If not, Mr. President, with the statement I made a little while ago that the bill will remain on the calendar subject to a motion to take it up at any time, I withdraw my motion at this time.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BYRD. Is unanimous consent required to withdraw the motion?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Not for this purpose.

Mr. BYRD. Even after the motion has been made a special order, unanimous consent is not required to withdraw it?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is true. The Senator has the right to withdraw his motion.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me observe for the benefit of the Senator from Virginia that not only is unanimous consent not required to withdraw the motion, but unanimous consent is not required for any Senator to make a similar motion to consider my bill in the future whenever he desires.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to announce while Senators are present that it is my purpose to move that the Senate adjourn until Thursday next.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] wishes to make a few remarks on another subject, after which I shall move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

DEPARTMENT OF AVIATION AND COMMITTEE ON AVIATION AFFAIRS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I hold in my hand a statement showing that in the years 1941 and 1942 the total amount appropriated for airplane construction

amounted to \$22,963,000,000 in round figures.

I send to the desk two resolutions and ask that they be read. After they are read I wish to address the Senate for a few minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolutions will be read.

The resolutions (S. Res. 238 and S. Res. 239) were read as follows:

Senate Resolution 238

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that there be established at the seat of government an executive department to be known as the Department of Aviation, which shall be administered by a Cabinet officer, known as the Secretary of Aviation, who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Senate Resolution 239

Resolved, That paragraph 1 of rule XXV of the standing rules of the Senate is amended by inserting, between the paragraph relating to the Committee on Military Affairs and the paragraph relating to the Committee on Mines and Mining, the following new paragraph:

"Committee on Military Aviation, to consist of 17 Senators."

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, it will be noted that one resolution suggests the creation of a separate Cabinet officer known as the secretary of aviation. I am putting the matter in this form because the bill of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], Senate bill 1635, has been pigeonholed. The second resolution would amend the Senate rules and create a Committee on Aviation Affairs.

It seems almost unnecessary to bring to this great body a recapitulation of the facts which demonstrate clearly that the air arm will be the determining factor in this war.

I am a member of the Naval Affairs Committee. There we constantly talk about building ships of the sea. We had better have a committee where we can talk about building ships of the air.

Until this war broke out and it was demonstrated that ships of the air are more important than ships of the sea, this Nation had given very little consideration to the importance of an air navy. We had prophets like Billy Mitchell, whose stature has grown with the passage of time, and whose prophetic vision—disregarded at the time—has made him a symbol of America's future domination of the air—domination if we have his vision and do not let lesser minds dominate the picture.

He, along with others, fought courageously and unselfishly to prepare America to meet a new kind of warfare, and to make America safe from assault from the air. Billy Mitchell and others fought against bureaucratic and rut-minded military leaders, and sacrificed themselves in that fight. Theirs was a fight to awaken America. They failed. It may be too late if we fail now.

General Mitchell was only one of many who saw the need, but who were literally "cashiered" for their vision. They saw the need of air supremacy and the significance of a navy of the air. It must be remembered that when Billy Mitchell was court-martialed the publicity which was given was definitely for the purpose

of telling men who had air vision that they had better stop their tactics or they would be retired or exiled. Let us remember that. The rut-minds ruled then. They must not continue to groove our action.

We now hear much of isolation, and of the attack upon men who did not want to get this country involved in war. If there ever was an isolationist group of men who had their eyes closed to realities, it was those men who would not and could not see the importance of aviation. Blindness is the worst form of isolation.

Mr. President, that condition still exists, in spite of recent history. We know now, after the fall of France with its Maginot line, the fall of Singapore with its half-billion dollars of defense, the fall of Poland, the occupation of Norway, the subjugation of the lowlands, the occupation of Crete, that the air arm dominates on land. On sea, the lesson of the occupation of Norway shows that the air arm also dominates the sea.

Do you remember Churchill saying when Hitler invaded Norway:

I consider that Hitler's action in invading Norway is as great a strategic and political error as that committed by Napoleon when he invaded Spain. He will now have to fight during the whole summer against powers possessing vastly superior naval forces and able to transport them to the scenes of action more easily than he can.

But Churchill found he was mistaken in this. His naval forces were obliged to withdraw in haste from the Kattegat and Skagerrak to escape destruction by Hitler's air arm. Churchill's air arm could not participate because it did not have the necessary range. When the British evacuated Narvik, they lost their aircraft carrier *Glorious* and other ships.

It was not the Navy that saved the British at Dunkerque; it was the flying lads of Britain in their Spitfires and Hurricanes. In this fight these planes were "within range." It was the airplane that saved Britain, the fighters of the R. A. F.; and Britain was not knocked out, because Germany was not properly prepared to do so. It was a failure in aviation, not of aviation. America now must not repeat the blunder.

We recall the battles of the Mediterranean when the British met the Italian Fleet and destroyed part of it. The Italians did not have air protection. But when the German bombers struck back into the Mediterranean the British Fleet suffered tremendously. Do we remember the story of the *Bismarck*, the ship which the Germans thought was beyond sinking? Again aviation proved what it could do.

Hitler's taking of Greece was another victory because of the air arm; and, of course, Crete fell because of the invasion from the skies. Even after all these experiences, the British still seemed to cling to the "old man of the sea" idea.

Since Japan has come into the picture we remember the story of the *Prince of Wales* and the *Repulse*.

We have yet to learn all the details of the sinking of our own ships by the dive bombers of the Japs. Apparently there are still folks in high positions who

cannot comprehend the meaning of these facts. Men get so much in a rut that they become specialists in only one line of thinking, blind to other important factors.

Mr. President, recently a great book came to my desk. It is called *Victory Through Air Power*, by Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky. I think it should be read by every American, and I believe every Representative and Senator should digest its message. We must not be blind leaders. When the blind lead the blind, both fall into the ditch.

In the concluding paragraph of that book Major de Seversky says:

I speak for all my colleagues in the aeronautical legions of the land, our gallant pilots, designers, engineers and manufacturers, the aerial strategists and the humblest aeronautical mechanics—and especially for the millions of American young people born into the air-power age and attuned to its dynamic rhythm—when I say that we airmen feel frustrated by the artificial restraints. We are eager to serve and ready to act when our beloved America says the word.

Mr. President, listen: These men say they "feel frustrated by the artificial restraints." When such an authority as Major de Seversky speaks, can we fail to stop and take notice? All of us have been living in glass houses.

For thousands of years, war has been a matter of fighting on land and sea; and now, when all at once we change to fighting in the air, it is difficult for the average mind to change and see the significance and the importance of the new arm. But there are prophets in Israel. General Mitchell was one. Major de Seversky is another. We should heed these prophets. Therefore, it seems all-important to me that now, when we are spending billions for airplane defense and offense—think of it; over \$22,000,000,000 appropriated for airplanes in less than 2 years—we who are the elected leaders of the Nation should have a committee here in the Senate studying this subject. I repeat: Over twenty-two billions have been appropriated in less than 2 years.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. Yes; I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am very much interested in the Senator's remarks, because he is touching on a subject to which I have given study for 9 years here in the Senate.

Mr. WILEY. Let me interrupt at that point and say to the distinguished Senator from Nevada—I think he was not in the Chamber when I began—that one of the resolutions I introduced was for the purpose of getting an expression of intent on behalf of the Senate because the bill of the Senator from Nevada had been pigeonholed.

Mr. McCARRAN. I appreciate the mention of the legislation which was proposed by me. Let me say that it is regrettable that our established agencies having national defense in their hands refuse to listen to suggestions coming from those who are just as much interested in national defense and in winning the war as they are, and refuse to accept ideas notwithstanding the fact that their soundness and the need of their ac-

ceptance are so manifest that one would think a child would accept them.

The fact of the matter is that since the day of Billy Mitchell we have gone to sleep in refusing to accept Mitchell's doctrine. Had Mitchell's doctrine and Mitchell's idea of unified air force been in existence, there never would have been a Pearl Harbor. The fact that we did not have a unified air force, the fact that the umbrella of air defense which we should have had was not covering our fleet in Pearl Harbor, gave opportunity for the slaughtering of our sailors and our soldiers and the destruction of units of our Navy at Pearl Harbor.

Let me say a further word while I am interrupting the Senator. Unless we bring about a unified air force to take care of our land and sea war activities, I have grave fear that this war will last longer than it should last, although I never have any fear that we shall not be victorious in the end.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the distinguished Senator for his contribution, and I agree with much that he has said.

Mr. President, I am not speaking on the subject of a unified air force. I feel, as Major de Seversky has said, that after we have seen that the Army and the Navy have obtained the planes they need, the important thing then is to see that they have an independent air force that can strike effectively. Major de Seversky brings out in this book the thesis, which I do not think can be contradicted, that the way to fight this war is not to fight it on all the tentacles, but to strike at the heart of the monster. He shows that we now have planes that can travel 7,800 miles without refueling. He knows that Hitler has them. We may expect, any day, a reprisal raid on the Atlantic coast. The important thing, however, is for America to become air-minded, awakened to the new world in which we are living.

This prophet, Major de Seversky, shows how the World War could be won, as I said, by striking at the heart of Japan, making it unnecessary to fight on a thousand fronts, as we are about to do.

Already, as I have said, we have airplanes that can travel 7,800 miles without refueling. Why should not this great body, the Senate of the United States, have a committee on aviation affairs? Are we simply creatures of some overlord in this matter? We have had in mind the thought of the Navy and the Army, and all that time we have had our Navy and Army committees. Now this thing has become so tremendously big that in 2 years we spend \$22,000,000,000 for airships; and yet the strategy involved, the style of planes, the judgment of the leaders in that new field are matters with which we have little or no contact, except as it is incidental to matters coming before the Senate Naval Affairs and the Senate Military Affairs Committees.

Have we not a responsibility? Are we simply going to pass that responsibility off to the Executive by voting the money? To me, Mr. President, this matter is so important that we should not delay another day in going into this subject fully and completely, and particularly by creating a committee on aviation affairs.

My resolution calls for that, and I ask that it be not pigeonholed. Certainly it is a matter which requires consideration because of the present safety and the future safety of America.

On the subject of having a Cabinet member who shall be known as the Secretary of Aviation, I think that is all-important also. The mere appointment of General Arnold by President Roosevelt does not meet the situation, and I say that with every respect for General Arnold and his record. Men who could not see, and would not see, the importance of this arm in the defense of the Nation in the past, who are ruttled in their own particular vocation because of years of training, however outstanding they may be in military or naval affairs, lack the power to provide guidance and direction to the Government in aviation affairs in this period when we are just opening up this field of conquest of the air.

Mr. President, the life of America is at stake, and no one can read this book of Major de Seversky's without realizing it. I had read many of the articles contained in the book when they were previously printed. He is a great American; not one like you and me, Mr. President, who were born here, but one who chose to make America his home. He has a fine background. He has had honors conferred upon him, including a medal presented to him by President Roosevelt. A man of his specialized aviation experience would be the kind to sit in the Cabinet as Secretary of Aviation, particularly now when world air strategy is all-important. World air strategy is something we never thought of in previous wars.

Recently Walter Lippmann, who had apparently also read this book, speaking about the "men who are fixed in a groove," made an interesting statement.

Since I came to the Senate I have frequently talked on the subject of "men who are fixed in a groove." I call it the "rut mind." We all have a tendency to get that way. Those in the legal profession, unless they are careful, become lawyers, and nothing else, and men in the medical profession become doctors and nothing else; and so on. Likewise, an Army man, tied to the land because of his background of many years, and a Navy man, tied to his ships that go over the water possess "rut minds." They have been the leaders, and, Mr. President, you and I know, if it had not been for that gallant little island called Britain, if she had not had her R. A. F. fighters, what would have happened to the west coast and the east coast of America? Some seem to think that the men of the Army and Navy can change overnight, but they cannot do so, because they never had air vision. We are appropriating a vast amount of money, but it is not simply a question of the number of planes; it is a question of air strategy and of the kind of planes. Goering missed the mark when he attacked Britain. He could have taken Britain easily if he had had the right kind of planes, but the Spitfire and Hurricane outfought the German planes, and, as a result, Goering lost seven or eight hundred planes. A

few of those Spitfires happened to be the omen of God for Britain in that day.

Let me read what Walter Lippmann, speaking of "men who are fixed in a groove," said:

The toughest obstructionists to deal with in Washington are not corrupt and they are not lazy and they are untouched by defeatism; what really needs saying about them is what an Oxford professor once said of a paper read by a student: "It was empty, magniloquent, abstract, flatulent . . . I could have wept salt tears. But I couldn't do anything else; the young man wanted a clean heart and a new spirit, not a little top dressing."

That is what Walter Lippmann said about those who are leading the procession. He also says:

We have come to an epoch when the destiny of the world will be determined by the mastery of the air.

Oh, if all of us could realize that fact and not just talk it. We spend day after day talking about domestic problems. We had an experience along that line this morning. And yet the destiny of America and of the world depends upon the mastery of the air. Mastery of the air will not be obtained by mere numbers, but by quality planes of different classes and kinds. Master minds of the air alone have this knowledge, not sea-minded and land-minded men. Strategists of the air are what are needed.

I am a member of the Naval Affairs Committee. There session after session we vote billions of dollars for ships such as the *Bismarck*, which went down when a bomb hit it—ships which take many days to sail across the ocean, when an airplane takes a few hours. Yet the idea of ships dominates our thinking and our approach to this war. Master minds of the air are in position to lead in the strategy that America must undertake.

Listen again to what Lippmann says. He reaches the same conclusion that Major de Seversky reached:

That until there is a specific strategy for taking and holding the skies—

That is it—"a specific strategy for taking and holding the skies"—

our plans must remain two-dimensional in conception and therefore, notwithstanding the physical participation of aircraft, seriously, if not fatally, handicapped in an epoch of three-dimensional warfare.

Most of us are still thinking in terms of two-dimensional warfare.

Oh, but I hear some one say, we have appropriated all this money. That is not sufficient. Merely appropriating money will not do the job. We have got to have the men who comprehend the job and the bigness of this global war, and what is necessary to put our opponents out of business.

Therefore, after the Army and Navy have the aircraft that are necessary, it is imperative that America have an air force capable of fighting and bombing the enemy; an air force commanded and developed by airmen who are as thoroughly at home in the air as are soldiers on the land and sailors on the sea. We have the finest group of youngsters in the world; they are making the finest fliers, man for man; they can outfight and out-

match any of those of other nations; but, because we have been lagging behind in our development of air strategy in a global war, we need men in the conduct of the war who are not tied to the sea or tied to the land.

We must see to it that the power which will govern the future will be in America's hands, and we must see to it also that in the field of strategy old outmoded ideas shall not take control. When I say "We" I mean the Senate of the United States cannot "pass the buck." If we do, we will wake up some day and regret it. We have a job to perform, and our job is to create a committee on aviation. The Senate, as a coordinate branch of government which votes the money, must realize that it is essential that it have a thorough understanding of what is involved. This can only come to pass if we create a Committee on Aviation Affairs in the Senate.

Mr. President, in conclusion let me state that I, myself, do not necessarily regard the creation of a department of military aviation as the ultimate answer to our military problems.

Frankly, in my judgment, the ideal method of dealing with our military affairs would be to have one Cabinet officer vested with complete unified military control of the entire conduct of the war. Under him there might be an Under Secretary of Aviation, an Under Secretary of the Army, and an Under Secretary of the Navy. Their efforts would be integrated through the unified command of one cabinet officer, under the President. That is, however, so momentous a change that its adoption would perhaps be impossible at this time.

Accordingly, in my proposal suggesting the creation of a department of military aviation, I am merely advancing the necessity for centralizing in one head the authority and control of our vast military aviation program—a head who is air-minded and capable of applying air strategy to world affairs.

It is absolutely vital that our war organization in Washington be reorganized to recognize the new emphasis which must be placed on aviation if this country is to survive. This is a time when we must realistically recognize that the direction of our war effort is entrusted to an outmoded, antiquated, outdated system, a system which is predicated on the simple assumption that wars are fought only by an army and by a navy.

When I talk about this rut mind, or, as Lippmann calls it, the "groove mind," I am talking about a condition that exists patently everywhere. The British have not as yet completely awakened. They have suffered defeat after defeat; they incurred the loss of two of their large war vessels, the *Prince of Wales* and the *Repulse*, in the Indian Ocean, under conditions similar to those in which others of their ships have been sunk. The point is that we must have men who understand aviation as their primary job, who live it and sleep it and think it, contrary to those who think in terms of land and sea, men who live in the air and can see the world in which they are flying in a matter of hours, for that day is coming. The danger to America now

and in the future is so tremendous, as I said, that we cannot "pass the buck."

I ask, Mr. President, that the resolutions be referred to the appropriate committee or committees. I express the hope that immediate action may result and that the resolutions will not be pigeonholed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Senate Resolution 238, submitted by the Senator from Wisconsin, will be referred to the Committee on Commerce, and Senate Resolution 239, also submitted by the Senator from Wisconsin, will be referred to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask that at the conclusion of my remarks certain excerpts from previous speeches delivered by me may be printed in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The excerpts are as follows:

[From speech by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, over Columbia Broadcasting System on the evening of October 17, 1939]

The War Department has recommended the smallest possible number of planes necessary for our defense. They will be ample only with one provision, and that is that our factories shall be allowed to sell enough planes to foreign countries so that the factories may be placed on a mass-production basis, so that the mistake of 1918 will not be repeated. Obviously we shall need fewer planes actually in the air if we can get more when we need them, and get them in a hurry.

I am convinced that that is even truer today than it was last February.

When dictators decide to make war, their decision is based upon only one question, and that is whether or not they are able to destroy the other nation. The arguments which prevailed at Munich were the comparative number of warplanes of the contending nations. The only language dictators understand is spoken from the mouths of cannons with tongues of fire. Therefore I favor enlarging the capacity of our factories and thereby strengthening our guaranty of peace. (Printed in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 76th Cong., 2d sess., vol. 85, p. 345, October 18, 1939.)

[From article by Ernest Lindley, the American Defense Problem, inserted in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on May 22, 1940, by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin]

The power of the German land forces is not our imminent concern. The power of Germany in the air is more important to us. German naval power may be a life-and-death matter to us.

German air power may be indicated by the fact—or belief of our best-informed people—that the German production of military planes now exceeds 3,000 planes per month and will reach 6,000 per month by fall. The German production at present is believed to exceed the total world production outside Germany. Ours this month is about 600 planes, and we won't reach 1,200 until about December. The Germans have a vast reserve of fully or partly trained pilots. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 76th Cong., 3d sess., May 22, 1940, p. 3135 (Appendix). Article reprinted from Washington Post of May 22, 1940.)

[From speech by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, on the floor of the U. S. Senate on May 31, 1940]

If we fail to train our youth with modern weapons, which means something more than simply loading a gun and firing it, we will fall in our responsibility to this and future ages. The lessons we must learn from overseas are too apparent. They are in the field

of equipment and training. It was the mechanized units, the supermechanized units, coupled with the use of mass bombers and quick transport of troops fully mechanized and equipped, that made the blitzkrieg possible. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 76th Cong., 3d sess., May 31, 1940, vol. 86, p. 7286.)

[From speech by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, on floor of the U. S. Senate on June 21, 1940]

I say it is time for us to develop an air force in this country and get away from those who can see only today and yesterday, but not tomorrow. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 76th Cong., 3d sess., June 21, 1940, vol. 86, p. 8769.)

[From speech by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, 1942, 77th Cong., 2d sess., p. 2107.]

I do not necessarily concur in every phase of Colonel Knox's foreign policy, but I am impressed by his dynamic plan for the formation of an aviation unit to recruit 10,000 volunteer pilots. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 76th Cong., 3d sess., July 10, 1940, vol. 86, p. 9395.)

[From speech by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, on floor of Senate on August 23, 1940]

We need . . .

(b) An air force to supplement the Navy and the land forces, adequate to repel in the air any attack on this continent from the air.

We need, of course, to step up our ability to produce ships, planes, mechanized equipment for the Army, etc.

The war overseas has taught us that the airplane is most effective when used to support naval units and ground troops. The Army needs planes; the Navy needs planes—planes of long-range type, bombers, attacking planes, etc. So we come to the conclusion that our first line of defense in the Western Hemisphere is a water line—our Navy. An adequate navy and adequate flying fortresses are what we must first obtain.

Our second line of defense is the airplane—observation planes, bombing planes, dive bombers, attack planes—plenty of them for the Navy and plenty for independent attack service. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 76th Cong., 3d sess., August 23, 1940, vol. 86, p. 10794.)

[From speech by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, on floor of Senate on September 14, 1940]

That brings up the second line of defense, which is the air fleet. We have found that the Navy must have a supplemental arm in the air. However, we are inadequately prepared in that respect. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 76th Cong., 3d sess., September 14, 1940, vol. 86, p. 12169.)

[From speech by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, on floor of Senate on February 14, 1941]

We cannot close our eyes to the realities. We certainly know that there are big stakes in this war game; but if Japan should fall for the seductive influence of Adolf Hitler and commit an overt act along the line I have suggested, then I tremble for the consequences to Japan and to the world.

I want to know what our Government knows about the situation. I want to know what kind of a supplemental air arm we have to our fleet in the east. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 77th Cong., 1st sess., February 14, 1941, vol. 87, p. 999.)

[From speech by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, on floor of Senate on April 3, 1941]

Mr. President, are we permitting the same closed minds—minds that were closed to the

arguments of Billy Mitchell—to remain closed to this matter of life and death, these fighting planes, the superiority of which is vital not only to our flyers but to the future of America? I repeat what I have said before on the floor of the Senate: Beware of the closed mind, the "ruttist" mind. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 77th Cong., 1st sess., April 3, 1941, vol. 87, p. 2691.)

[From speech made by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, on floor of Senate on May 20, 1941]

If, by the official vindication of the name of this great soldier, we will make the road a little easier for the present-day "Billy Mitchells" who are fighting antiquated tactics, caste controls, and red-tape methods, that official vindication will not have been in vain.

The ideas and the beliefs which Billy Mitchell held so tenaciously in the face of brass-hat opposition have been demonstrated as correct. Mitchell has been vindicated, and his ideas today stand as a living memorial which we cannot add to nor detract from. It remains only for us to make certain that his memorial will continue to live through the men—the independent thinkers, the independent adventurers and explorers and inventors—who will follow him.

We have only to look to the skies to see the mighty air fleet that is the answer to the question of whether Billy Mitchell was right. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 77th Cong., 1st sess., May 20, 1941, vol. 87, p. 4239.)

[From speech by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, before the Central Retail Feed Association convention, Schroeder Hotel, Milwaukee, Wis., on June 9, 1941]

I say to you today that the necessity which General Mitchell saw more than 15 years ago for the establishment of a separate air branch is more imperative than ever before.

Mitchell was a farseeing man. He commanded the American Expeditionary Forces' air forces in France. He was convinced that the airplane would be a decisive factor in all future wars. More than a decade and one-half ago he advocated aerial torpedoes, parachute troops, troop-transport planes, heavy-gun combat planes, and air bases in Alaska. (Printed in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 77th Cong., 1st sess., June 19, 1941, vol. 87, p. A2946) (Appendix.)

[From speech by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, on floor of Senate on July 29, 1941]

The ideas and the vision of Billy Mitchell were accepted by another gentleman on this globe, and that was Mr. Goering, in Germany. In every detail he carried out the methods Billy Mitchell attempted to teach to the brass hats in this country, and the result was the predominating air force which has given Germany the victory on every battlefield so far except in Russia.

The significant thing, I repeat, is that the men who now realize they had no vision, the men who because of their lack of vision, have made it possible for our own country to be unprepared, still persist in their blindness. The result of such blindness may be of great damage to this country, as it has been in the past. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 77th Cong., 1st sess., July 29, 1941, p. 6414.)

[From speech by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, on the floor of the Senate on August 7, 1941]

We have to be realistic. I wish to say that from information I have after talking with some of our air generals, we are going places with our increased capacity in the building of bombers and fighting planes, with our developing 40,000 men a year in the Air Service, and it is a mighty satisfactory thing to

know that America is going to be able to look after herself if need be. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 77th Cong., 1st sess., August 7, 1941, vol. 87, p. 6851.)

[From speech by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, on the floor of the Senate on October 16, 1941]

We still have men in positions of leadership who seem to be unaware of the air ocean and the significance of the navies in the air.

In this article, Mr. President, Major de Seversky restates the truth, the significant truth, that it was the Royal Air Force controlling the skies over the English Channel and over the islands that stemmed the tide of Nazi invasion of Britain. The British evacuation from Dunkirk was also due to the British domination of the sky over that operation. The Major brings out very conclusively the point that America's need is long-range air power. . . . But to go back to the Major's discussion for a few further words, the Major disagrees with Colonel Knox's recent statement which is mentioned in full in the article; and, while I am a member of the Naval Affairs Committee and believe there will always be need for a surface Navy, the thing I desire to emphasize now, because this distinguished writer on the subject makes it so clear in his article, is the fact that we are living in a changed world, and, above all, the ocean of the air is the important factor; and we have more than ever to realize that whether we get control of the air depends upon the leadership we have, the men of vision who are not simply walking the decks of naval craft, and still believing, as they have done through the years, that the ships of the water are the important factor.

. . . I am of the opinion that the Major establishes a good case in his article when he calls for America to wake up, when he requests that Americans get a new understanding—ah! this is important—of the physical world in which we are living and when he states:

"In this era of air power, America must integrate itself with the new force, and every American psychologically must become an aviator if we want to preserve our precious heritage of free institutions." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 77th Cong., 1st sess., October 16, 1941, p. 7932—article mentioned by Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky, Air Power Ends Isolation, reprinted in full at conclusion of remarks by Senator.)

[Excerpt from article entitled "Air Force Is Answer," by Al Williams, inserted in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin]

"Japan must be bombed."

Don't tell me a national defense system can't be revised in wartime. The British did just that when they severed the Royal Flying Corps from control of the British Army and the Royal Naval Air Service from the British Admiralty during the last war.

Realistic Englishmen coordinated England's two air services into the present Royal Air Force. We will follow that example some day, and it should be now. (From the Washington Daily News of December 22, 1941, appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—Senate, December 22, 1941, p. A5689, 77th Cong., 1st sess.)

[Excerpt from remarks by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY of Wisconsin, on the late Brig. Gen. William Mitchell]

The domination of the air we must have and retain, and we must put a premium on the men of foresight and invention—men who are big enough to get out of the rut today, to cut out red tape and put efficiency into the picture. (From CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 30, 1941, 77th Cong., 1st sess., p. 10128.)

[Excerpts from remarks by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin]

Mr. President, I am hoping that the tens of thousands of flyers who are soon going to take to the ocean of the air to win victory for America will form a great air corps called the Billy Mitchell air division, and thus carry into the battle for the liberation of the world the vision and the spirit of a great and a martyred American. (From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 12, 1942, 77th Cong., 2d sess., p. 252.)

Some of us have been reading articles by experts in relation to the coming power in the air. One expert demonstrated conclusively that a few years hence the airships of one nation riding the ether will be able in a few hours to fly across the intervening seas, and if the nation has control of the air, put out of business every industry in the nation they attack. (From CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 5, 1942, 77th Cong., 2d sess., p. 1049.)

We need men in positions of command who do not lean toward one angle or the other, but who see the whole problem from the perspective of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Corps. (From CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 9, 1942, 77th Cong., 2d sess., p. 2107.)

STRIKES IN WAR PRODUCTION INDUSTRIES—MAN-DAYS LOST

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the statement has frequently been made of late that there are practically no strikes in the country, but every day the newspapers state that strikes occur here and there. As a matter of fact, Mr. President, there have been more man-days lost by strikes since Pearl Harbor than in a similar period 2 years ago. In January, February and March of 1940, 923,647 man-days were lost by strikes. In January, February, and March of 1942, 1,265,000 man-days have been lost, an increase of more than one-third above the same period 2 years ago.

Every strike that has occurred since Pearl Harbor has affected our national defense program, as all industries now are essential either to the production of war materials or to the maintenance of our civilian population.

During the month of March there were 240 strikes, with a loss of 450,000 man-days of work.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks a statement I have obtained from the United States Department of Labor, giving the number of man-days lost due to strikes since January 1940. For the year 1940 a total of 6,700,872 man-days were lost, and for the year 1941 a total of 22,885,757 man-days were lost. If strikes continue for the remainder of 1942 as they have for the first 3 months, it appears that the total of man-days lost in 1942 will be equal to or exceed the man-days lost in 1940.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Virginia?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[U. S. Department of Labor, Monthly Labor Review, February 1942]

	Man-days idle during month or year
1940:	
January.....	246,674
February.....	289,992
March.....	386,981
April.....	441,866

	Man-days idle during month or year
1940:	
May.....	665,688
June.....	484,007
July.....	585,651
August.....	706,308
September.....	780,570
October.....	915,014
November.....	739,807
December.....	458,314
Total.....	6,700,872
1941:	
January.....	659,285
February.....	1,129,556
March.....	1,553,860
April.....	7,106,126
May.....	2,182,693
June.....	1,468,856
July.....	1,305,136
August.....	1,756,377
September.....	1,885,224
October.....	1,888,644
November.....	1,450,000
December.....	500,000
Total.....	22,885,757
1942:	
January.....	390,000
February.....	425,000
March.....	450,000

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting several naval nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MCKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters (favorably reported); and

Bernice B. Lyons, to be postmaster at Vinton, La., in place of S. A. Fairchild, retired (adversely reported).

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs (favorably reported):

Rear Admiral Robert L. Ghormley, to be a vice admiral in the Navy for temporary service, to rank from the 18th day of September 1941; and

Several officers for appointment, and sundry citizens for appointment as second lieutenants, all in the Marine Corps.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Stephen W. Brennan to be United States district judge for the northern district of New York.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Harry C. Blanton to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Missouri.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Sterling Hutcheson to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Virginia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Ford S. Worthy to be United States marshal for the eastern district of North Carolina.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William Thomas Dowd to be United States marshal for the middle district of North Carolina.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert L. Ailworth to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Virginia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John White Stuart to be United States marshal for the western district of Virginia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the postmaster nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all confirmations of today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, April 30, 1942, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 28 (legislative day of March 30), 1942:

APPOINTMENTS TO TEMPORARY SERVICE IN THE NAVY

Capt. Lylal A. Davidson to be a rear admiral in the Navy for temporary service, to rank from the 30th day of November 1941.

Capt. Charles A. Pownall to be a rear admiral in the Navy for temporary service, to rank from the 3d day of December 1941.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 28 (legislative day of March 30), 1942:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Stephen W. Brennan to be United States district judge for the northern district of New York.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Harry C. Blanton to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Missouri.
Sterling Hutcheson to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Virginia.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Ford S. Worthy to be United States marshal for the eastern district of North Carolina.

William Thomas Dowd to be United States marshal for the middle district of North Carolina.

Robert L. Ailworth to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Virginia.

John White Stuart to be United States marshal for the western district of Virginia.

POSTMASTERS

GEORGIA

Ruth D. McClure, Acworth.
Dan L. Gibson, Albany.
Leighton W. McPherson, Columbus.
Troy Howard Vickers, Crawfordville.
Wylie West, Decatur.
Lawrence J. McPhaul, Doerun.
B. Clayton Blanton, Thomasville.
Roy Thrasher, Tifton.

KANSAS

Walter Koon, Clearwater.
George E. Hull, Eureka.
Frank M. McAdam, Moran.
Anna C. Linscheid, North Newton.

MICHIGAN

Ervin C. Duncley, Frederic.
Rolland P. Lee, Millington.
Alphonsus E. Murphy, Shepherd.

TEXAS

Ramiro R. Gonzalez, Benavides.
George C. Lain, Kopperl.
James Thomas Coleman, Livingston.
Joe H. Victory, New Willard.
Laura A. Bruening, Westhoff.

WASHINGTON

Hazel P. Chester, Richmond Highlands.
Ethel M. Eke, Tumwater.

WISCONSIN

Andrew Noble Lawton, Brodhead.
Gerald A. Peterson, Sharon.
Boyd H. Gentz, Verona.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, APRIL 28, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O King of kings and Lord of lords, behold the passions of men. To any who are in distress, to any whose consciences oppress and cloud their souls with guilt, lift up Thy voice of righteousness and triumph. As Thy life carries with it eternal sympathy and succor, as a Divine Saviour, bestow Thy compassion and grant Thy forgiveness. We praise Thee, that Thou didst bring to mankind, with all its sorrows, struggles, and aspirations, the gulf stream of the world's hope and salvation.

Grant that a stalwart faith may throb in the blood of our daily lives, making them heroic and eager by the divine essence of spirituality which enters into the commonest deeds. May we be Thy disciples in the way of self-denial, bearing some cross and ending in the quiet joy of self-forgetfulness; thus we may grow into the higher life in which our

hearts go out lovingly to our fellow men and to the beauty and glory of the world. Teach us the deepest meaning of the wonderful, precious sacrifice of the Christ, revealing the heart of an infinite, holy God—the Strong baring His shoulder to carry the burdens of the weak; the Highest stooping to save the lowest; and the Holiest coming to ransom the world. In our dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 736. An act for the relief of Ideal Service Station;

H. R. 1154. An act for the relief of George C. Dewey;

H. R. 3476. An act for the relief of George Quillman;

H. R. 4180. An act for the relief of Edward Keating and others;

H. R. 4331. An act for the relief of Alice R. Swett;

H. R. 4408. An act for the relief of Alice R. Swett and the estate of Robert S. Swett;

H. R. 4413. An act for the relief of Olive Z. Ressler;

H. R. 4981. An act for the relief of the Phoenix Construction Associates, a partnership;

H. R. 5433. An act for the relief of the guardian of Charles Jirinec, an infant;

H. R. 5857. An act for the relief of Roy F. Lassly, former acting chief disbursing clerk, Department of the Interior, and G. F. Allen, chief disbursing officer, Division of Disbursement, Treasury Department;

H. R. 5932. An act to ratify and confirm Act 20 of the Special Session Laws of Hawaii, 1941, extending the time within which revenue bonds may be issued and delivered under Act 174 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1935;

H. R. 6020. An act granting the consent and approval of Congress to an interstate compact relating to the better utilization of the fisheries (marine, shell, and anadromous) of the Atlantic seaboard and creating the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission;

H. R. 6063. An act for the relief of the Clark County Lumber Co.;

H. R. 6166. An act to approve Act No. 70 of the Special Session Laws of Hawaii, 1941, reducing the rate of interest on loans and providing for the reamortization of indebtedness to the Farm Loan Board; and

H. R. 6641. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a permanent instruction staff at the United States Coast Guard Academy," approved April 16, 1937.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 809. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Vernon Clemons, Jr.;

H. R. 4579. An act to amend subsection (c) of section 1 of Public, No. 846, Seventy-fourth Congress (S. 3055), an act to provide conditions for the purchase of supplies and the making of contracts by the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5143. An act to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended;

H. R. 5295. An act for the relief of the estate of Romano Emiliani;

H. R. 5449. An act for the relief of Mrs. Cecile Herzog and Lucille Herzog (an infant);

H. R. 5596. An act for the relief of Tommy Huddleston;

H. R. 5845. An act for the relief of Alvira Manfredi; and

H. R. 6604. An act providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States, including the Territory of Alaska.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 244. An act for the relief of the San Francisco Mountain Scenic Boulevard Co.;

S. 506. An act to limit the time within which the General Accounting Office shall make final settlement of the monthly or quarterly accounts of disbursing officers under the executive branch of the Government, and for other purposes;

S. 2109. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to sell and convey to the town of Marmet, W. Va., two tracts of land to be used for municipal purposes;

S. 2190. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marilla C. Gray;

S. 2292. An act for the relief of Vernon E. Deus;

S. 2315. An act for the relief of dealers in certain articles or commodities rationed under authority of the United States;

S. 2368. An act to amend the joint resolution approved August 27, 1940 (54 Stat. 858), as amended, and the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 885), as amended, so as to remove the requirement that medical statements shall be furnished to those persons performing military service thereunder;

S. 2422. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to designate the titles of certain offices and departments of instruction at the United States Military Academy;

S. 2427. An act to amend the act relating to preventing the publication of inventions in the national interest, and for other purposes;

S. 2451. An act for the relief of Anthony W. Livingston;

S. 2469. An act for the relief of William Edward Fleming; and

S. Con. Res. 28. Concurrent resolution relative to the bill (S. 2202) to reinstate Paul A. Larned, a major, United States Army, retired, to the active list of the Regular Army.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1765. An act for the relief of the minor children of Mrs. Jesus Zamora Felix, deceased; and

S. 2002. An act for the relief of Donald William Burt.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1563) entitled "An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Albert M. Howard," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BROWN, Mr. ELLENDER, and Mr. CAPPER to be conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government,"

for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of the Treasury.
3. Department of War.
4. Executive Office of the President.
5. Federal Security Agency.
6. Federal Works Agency.
7. General Accounting Office.
8. The National Archives.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a short editorial and a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial entitled "The Foresight of President Roosevelt."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

THE LATE MRS. WILLIAM D. LEAHY

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, on last Wednesday in Vichy, France, there passed to her eternal reward Mrs. William D. Leahy, wife of the American Ambassador to France. Mrs. Leahy had previously undergone an operation from which she was apparently recovering and, only the night before she died had made plans with her husband to return to the United States. Mrs. Leahy is survived by Admiral Leahy and a son, Lt. Comdr. William Harrington Leahy now on duty in London. Since 1897 Admiral Leahy has served our country faithfully and well.

In my opinion, Mrs. Leahy gave her life in the service of our country because, in spite of all kinds of difficulties and advanced years, she traveled with her husband to his post in war-torn France. In France, as in other parts of the world, in which Mrs. Leahy lived, in connection with her husband's naval services, she took an active part in welfare work, and one of her last public acts was to make a large donation to the Red Cross.

Mrs. Leahy was born in California and was married to Admiral Leahy in San Francisco in the year of 1904. Her knowledge of foreign languages was a great asset to her husband in his naval and diplomatic duties.

In his hour of great trial and anguish Admiral Leahy has my deep and sincere sympathy and, I am sure, the sympathy and affection of every Member of Congress, all of the men and women in the armed forces, and millions of other grateful Americans.

This lovely lady died nobly in the service of her country—while her country was at war—which prompts me prayer-

fully to hope that God will hasten the fulfillment of the prophecy of His prophet, Isaiah, who said:

And they shall beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall there be war any more.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a letter and a resolution from a labor union on the 40-hour week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include a quotation from the Hillsboro Journal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

GEN. DOUGLAS MACARTHUR DAY

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, June 13, 1942, will mark the anniversary of the appointment of Gen. Douglas MacArthur to the United States Military Academy as a cadet from the State of Wisconsin. Because of what General MacArthur symbolizes to the people of the United States of America and the Allied Nations fighting for democracy in this war, I am offering a joint resolution today asking that the President issue a proclamation inviting the people of the United States of America to observe June 13, 1942, with suitable patriotic and public exercises throughout the land as Douglas MacArthur Day.

[Here the gavel fell.]

LONGEVITY CREDIT FOR ENLISTED MEN OF THE NAVAL AND MARINE CORPS RESERVE

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Naval Affairs, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4869) to provide for longevity credit for enlisted men of the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, and agree to the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 4, after "Reserve", where it appears the second time, insert "and."

Page 1, lines 4 and 5, strike out "and the Army Reserves" and insert "of the United States."

Page 1, line 6, after "service", insert "since June 30, 1925."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "deserve or" and insert "Reserve."

Page 1, line 8, after "Reserve", insert "and the National Guard: *Provided*, That warrant officers and enlisted men of the National Guard of the United States shall not be credited for this purpose with time served in the inactive National Guard not in the active Federal service."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to provide for longevity credit for enlisted men of the Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, and the National Guard of the United States, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS]?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the Committee on Naval Affairs has authorized the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota to call up that bill. We have unanimously agreed to the Senate amendments.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have the gentleman from Minnesota explain the bill and the amendments.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, this bill passed the House a month or more ago and has been passed by the Senate, with certain perfecting amendments, simply rearranging the wording of some amendments which were adopted in the House to include the Army and National Guard.

The bill has for its purpose granting longevity credit to enlisted men in the Reserve on the same basis as it is credited to officers. Another amendment places a limiting date of June 30, 1925, because that is the date from which officers get longevity credit in the Reserve. It simply puts the enlisted men on exactly the same basis as officers in the Reserves.

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield.

Mr. GEHRMANN. Does that still leave out those who served in the last war who since then have not kept up their Reserve status and, of course, are not now entitled to longevity consideration under the present law, as I understand it?

Mr. MAAS. If they had not been in the Reserve they would not be eligible for longevity credit, anyway. If they reenter the Reserve now they will get credit for their active World War service. That is correct.

Mr. GEHRMANN. That is what I wanted to know.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, for the past 2 or 3 weeks I have had considerable experience with the War Production Board set-up. I find myself in accord with the objective sought by this Board; I think the objective is one with which the American people are in accord, because they are willing to be controlled and have various scarce materials conserved. They are willing to make any necessary sacrifice to win this war. Never in my life have I experienced the kind of treatment that has been accorded me in the various War Production Board set-ups; they do not seem to know how to handle matters without long delays; you cannot find the head of a department

and when you get there you find you have to go seek another, and so on.

Apparently this House has simply overlooked taking the kind of action which will put them in harness. I think one trouble is that too many of the officials are without business experience. Another is that virtually all of the officials are from the large cities and either do not understand or do not care about small-town business and rural problems. If the War Production Board is to do the job before it they must gear themselves up to wartime speed and cut out about nine-tenths of the present red tape.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, this morning I received in the mail a letter from the Reverend Walter W. McNeil, vicar of St. John's Episcopal Church, at Jackson, Wyo., in which he says:

You might be interested to know that each evening at 6 o'clock our church bell rings for about a minute, reminding the people of the community to pause for a minute and remember their loved ones who are in the armed forces, and to pray that we may be worthy of a just and durable peace. The men away know this, and it binds us all more closely together.

It occurs to me, Mr. Speaker, that it would be a splendid practice for the churches of all communities to have a fixed time each day when the bell of the church would ring as a reminder to the people of our responsibility for those in the armed forces. It would help to keep us conscious of the need for doing our part toward backing up these men by the purchase of Defense stamps and bonds and by giving of our services wherever we can.

In my own State I propose to recommend to the pastors of the various churches that the hour of 6 o'clock be uniformly adopted for a brief ringing of church bells, calling the people to a moment's pause for remembrance and silent prayer. I am sure that the newspapers of Wyoming will gladly give publicity to the idea and proper credit to Reverend McNeil for initiating it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

THE RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION AND SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, we have of late heard within and without Congress much criticism of Mr. Jesse Jones and the R. F. C. It is charged that they have deserted small business.

Such charge is as unjust as it is unfounded. It might be well for those who indiscriminately hurl charges at the R. F. C. to ponder the record. It has immeasurably benefited small business.

Over 53 percent of all its business loans have been \$10,000 or under; over 37 percent have been \$5,000 or under.

That does not show disregard of small business. On the contrary, it shows a studied purpose to aid.

Of a total number of 9,937 loans, 3,730 have been for \$5,000 or under.

Let these carping critics apologize or at least cease their unfair attitude. I herewith submit a most enlightened record:

Size of business loans as of Mar. 31, 1942

(Number of loans and participations authorized by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to business enterprises, excluding commitments outstanding and all national defense loans)

(Includes banks' share in sales of participations, inasmuch as the Reconstruction Finance Corporation authorizes and disburses full amount in each case)

Size of loans	Number of loans and participations	Percent of total	Amount authorized
\$5,000 and under.....	3,730	37.6	\$8,689,826.28
\$5,001 to \$10,000, inclusive.....	1,571	15.8	12,610,825.87
\$10,001 to \$25,000, inclusive.....	1,908	19.2	34,272,194.83
\$25,001 to \$50,000, inclusive.....	1,114	11.2	43,630,673.13
\$50,001 to \$100,000, inclusive.....	803	8.1	62,886,051.91
\$100,001 to \$200,000, inclusive.....	424	4.3	63,647,073.66
\$200,001 to \$500,000, inclusive.....	280	2.8	89,556,172.70
\$500,001 to \$1,000,000, inclusive.....	63	.6	46,704,896.24
Over \$1,000,000.....	44	.4	123,067,398.45
Total.....	9,937	100.0	485,065,113.07

¹ Includes \$11,158,294.58 representing banks' shares in sales of participations.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place a portion of the R. F. C. record into our own Record.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein three resolutions by the Senate and Assembly of the State of New York.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE LIBERTY BELL

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to extend my own remarks in the Record, and to include therein certain extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. SCOTT addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

THE OMNIBUS RIVERS AND HARBORS BILL

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. PITTENGER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

CONFERENCE ON UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, in 1939 and 1940 a group of Members of the House organized themselves into what was known as the Conference on Unemployment. In the summer of 1940 we issued a final report and suggested a program, from which I would like to read two items, the fourteenth and fifteenth points. First, the fourteenth point read as follows:

(14) Passage of legislation to provide for development of strategic and critical metallic and nonmetallic materials within our own borders. The purpose of such legislation, aside from relieving unemployment, is the encouragement of private enterprise to relieve this Nation of its dependence upon foreign countries for vital military supplies, many of which are essential to national defense.

The fifteenth point was this:

(15) The encouragement through appropriate legislation of the cultivation of agricultural products heretofore not grown in the United States, such as rubber, and of new industrial uses for agricultural products.

It was in the summer of 1940 that this group of House Members issued this report, and I think it is no more than fair to them to draw to the attention of the Members of the House the matter published in this little booklet.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. CANNON of Missouri addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein a letter on pensions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SAUTHOFF]?

There was no objection.

APPEALS BY UNITED STATES TO CIRCUIT COURTS OF APPEALS

Mr. McLAUGHLIN submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 139) to permit appeals by the United States to the Circuit Courts of Appeals in certain cases.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include an address which I delivered at the Benjamin Franklin High School dedication exercises.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO]?

There was no objection.

DEFENSE OF NEW YORK

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States and Lieutenant General Drum, commanding officer of the eastern defense area, have emphasized a number of times that the city of New York is a bull's-eye for the enemy as a target. Up until this time, however, the city of New York has not derived any benefit from the act of Congress which appropriated \$100,000,000 for equipment essential to air-raid wardens, auxiliary fire fighters, and plane spotters. The city of New York has not received a dollar's worth of much-needed equipment, it was revealed by Mayor La Guardia yesterday.

I cannot understand why we are so lax in finding out what has been done with the money which we have appropriated to protect the civilian population and to give the air-raid wardens the tools and the proper implements to cope with air raids. The mayor of the city of New York, who has always been very conscientious in protecting the people of New York against any and all types of danger and who through his work with the Office of Civilian Defense knows what is necessary to assure this protection to the people of our city, has publicly protested against this lack of equipment. Let us hope that the proper authorities in Washington heed his warning in time and supply New York, as well as the rest of the country, with the necessary equipment to fight air raids.

[Here the gavel fell.]

WAR PRODUCTION BOARD

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, my experience with the Priority Division of War Production Board is exactly the opposite of that stated by the gentleman from North Carolina. I, too, have had much business with them in recent days. For instance, we had to cut over in our country from a situation where we used many, many sacks for taking care of wheat and other crops. We had to provide elevator and crib facilities to take care of those crops on the farm. We had to get priorities on nails, hardware, and other things, but I found the Priority Division of the Board most cooperative and most helpful. This is due to the untiring and competent liaison officer for the House, Mr. W. J. Hays.

They are undertaking a tremendous task and Members should not complain, but, on the other hand, should help the Board. I have noticed that if you conform to the requests they make, then they will take up your request, put it before the Board and you will get action.

I am getting trucks, I am getting elevators for my people so that they can take care of their crops. I think the Priority Division of the War Production Board is doing a wonderful work.

[Here the gavel fell.]

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of the majority leader if he can tell us the program for the rest of the week?

Mr. McCORMACK. The resolution providing funds for the Dies committee is the first order of business today. Following that there will be the bill from the Committee on Banking and Currency for whose consideration unanimous consent was granted yesterday, with debate to be limited to 1 hour. This bill is known as the bill for the aid and relief of automobile dealers.

Tomorrow there will be considered a bill from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce (H. R. 6156) to amend section 321, title III, part 2, of the Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic, commonly known as the land-grant bill.

Other than that, I have nothing to advise the House of at this time that will come up for the remainder of the week. The probability is that on Thursday I shall ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Thursday it adjourn to meet the following Monday.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman does not yet know about the program for Monday or Tuesday of next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. I have no further program to announce at this time.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short essay.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

THE DIES COMMITTEE

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the appropriation of \$110,000 that I understand the Committee on Accounts is reporting to the House for the purpose of carrying on the activities of the Dies committee. I am going to ask the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN], the chairman of the committee, to yield to permit me to offer an amendment under the parliamentary procedure—the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] has control of

the time—and it is up to him to say whether he will yield for that purpose. I do not know whether or not he will so yield, but my amendment, if I have a chance to offer it, proposes to cut this amount to \$35,000. I understand commitments have been made which might require this amount. I want to see everybody who has been hired by the committee and done any work for it paid and clean the matter up and let the committee remain in status quo for the duration of the war. I think it will serve a better purpose if the committee just be quiet for a while.

Information obtained by this committee should be turned over to the F. B. I. or the Department of Justice, or the Intelligence Department of the Army or Navy, to the end that the Department of Justice could take suitable action and the information should not be given to the newspapers. It only wises up law violators and the enemies of our country to proceed in this fashion.

HON. GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I was stunned last night when I read the announcement of the withdrawal of our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts, Representative GEORGE HOLDEN TINKHAM. You may have differed with him regarding foreign policy, but you admired the fierce sincerity, strong integrity, and the manifest patriotism of this distinguished son of New England. Rooted deep in the history of that great area, GEORGE TINKHAM's forebears on both sides have given him the brave characteristics that have been so admired by the world—those gifted qualities of a manly sense of duty, perseverance, and intellectual valor that have given our people its supremacy in the stern art of labor.

His departure from this House and from our Committee on Foreign Affairs will deprive us of a great American, whose sincerity, whose patriotism, and whose wide and cosmopolitan travels have given us on that great committee an insight and an adventure that those in succeeding Congresses will miss.

He reads much, he is a great observer, and he looks quite through the deeds of men.

Those lines of Shakespeare remind me of my colleague. This is, indeed, a hurried minute in which to pay tribute to a great American.

[Here the gavel fell.]

AUTOMOBILE AND TIRE RATIONING

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, the present automobile and tire rationing program bears all the earmarks of being designed and administered by persons

who may have good intentions, but absolutely no knowledge of the retail automobile business. If there is anyone connected with it who has ever been an automobile dealer, I have not yet been able to find him. The program looks as though it had been set up by a group of New York subway straphangers. The present rationing policy is nothing more or less than a Government-imposed bankruptcy sale, for the benefit of a very select few chosen ones, who obtain certificates and then go from agency to agency loudly proclaiming their political influence while looking for the dealer who is so hard pressed for ready cash that he is forced to make a sale at below his own cost.

Reports from 51 dealers in my district show that they have 3,359 cars and trucks on hand, and at the present rate of doing business, the last of these vehicles will be sold and delivered in 1954, 12 years from now. New cars, with their tires, batteries, and upholstery rotting, are being stored in open fields for lack of warehouse space or money with which to pay for storage space in a warehouse. The higher priced cars cannot be sold at all, for there are no buyers. Citizens of Glendale, Calif., have been forced to throw garbage in the streets while the Washington Office of Price Administration leisurely decides whether or not the municipality of Glendale can obtain 3 trucks, with specially built bodies for handling garbage, which have been ready for delivery to them since last December.

When the baby has the colic, give him candy; it may shut him up, but it will make him sicker. H. R. 6995 is another typical New Deal all-day sucker. But oh the pain when the succor has been sucked dry.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein a copy of an order issued by the War Department relating to political activities of military personnel on active duty, which I think ought to be in the Record for the information of those interested.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I further ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein an editorial recently appearing in the Boston Post, entitled "Too Little, Too Late."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

THE DIES COMMITTEE

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts, I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 475) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the expenses of conducting the investigation authorized by House Resolution 282 of the Seventy-fifth Congress, and continued under House Resolution 26 of the

Seventy-sixth Congress, and House Resolution 321 of the Seventy-sixth Congress, House Resolution 90 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, and House Resolution 420 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, incurred by the special committee appointed to investigate un-American activities in the United States and related questions, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$110,000, in addition to the unexpended balance heretofore appropriated for this purpose during the first session of the Seventy-seventh Congress, including expenditures for the employment of experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

Sec. 2. That the official committee reporters may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, if not otherwise officially engaged.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. Wait until I make a statement.

Mr. Speaker, as all know, the House, by a very substantial majority, on a record vote, extended the life of the so-called Dies committee. Following that action it becomes necessary for the Committee on Accounts to consider an appropriation for that select committee to carry on its activities. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] in a letter addressed to me, copies of which he sent to other members of the committee, and I think some Members of the House, requested an appropriation of \$300,000 to carry on the activities of the committee from now to the end of the Congress, which expires in January.

A strange situation developed after the House acted on that resolution. The Committee on Accounts received hundreds and hundreds of letters from all over the United States and also resolutions adopted from various organizations requesting the committee to deny any appropriation whatsoever to the Dies committee. The Committee on Accounts has always considered action by the House as a mandate to bring in a resolution that will enable such a committee to function.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. I think in all fairness the gentleman should also mention there were a considerable number who wrote in endorsing the Dies committee and its organization.

Mr. COCHRAN. Of course the gentleman is correct, and I will add there were a considerable number favoring a large appropriation, but the majority were in opposition. It was by no means one-sided.

The Committee on Accounts is not a legislative committee. It has long since adopted the policy only to hear Members of Congress in reference to resolutions pending before it. It has never permitted outsiders to appear. Its meetings are executive sessions. Every Member of the Congress who requested to appear before the committee while this resolution was under consideration had an opportunity to do so. The gentleman from

Alabama [Mr. STARNES], the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CASEY], members of the Dies committee, appeared before the committee. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] was unable to attend. I postponed meetings several times, hoping he could appear. Sickness in his family, he advised me, kept him in Texas.

I may also say Members of Congress who desired to oppose the appropriation were given an opportunity to do so. In fact, they consumed most of the time. Strange to say, some Members of the Congress who voted to extend the time or the life of the Dies committee came before the Committee on Accounts and wanted us not to appropriate any money whatsoever. In other words, they vote on the floor of the House for a resolution to extend the life of the committee and then want to come downstairs and ask the representative of the House, the Accounts Committee, to deny an appropriation for the committee to function.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Is the gentleman in accord with what the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] did with reference to the information he secured in connection with certain persons employed in a certain bureau headed by Vice President WALLACE, giving that information to the press and to the public without first giving it to the Department of Justice or to the Vice President of the United States, the head of the bureau referred to? Are you in accord with that policy? This was one of the reasons that changed my mind about the continuance of the Dies committee.

Mr. COCHRAN. I am not here to discuss anything the Dies committee has done. That was the duty of the Rules Committee. I am here today to give the House an opportunity to vote on a resolution—

Mr. O'CONNOR. May I say to the gentleman—

Mr. COCHRAN. Wait a minute—to vote on a resolution for the Dies committee to function. I am not condemning the Dies committee in any manner, nor discussing its activities. I consider that passed when the House voted to extend the life of the committee.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Why does the gentleman condemn anybody who changes his mind after having voted to continue this committee, when he finds the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] engaged in the practices which to my mind are more harmful than helpful—

Mr. COCHRAN. That is the gentleman's viewpoint and he can have that viewpoint.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I have that viewpoint. I feel we should all have one objective and that is unity of action and purpose in winning the war.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. In view of the fact that there was a roll call on the continuation of the life of the committee, certainly the Members should welcome

a roll-call vote on appropriating funds to carry it forward.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

It is for the House to decide if there is to be a record vote. Certainly I have no desire to prevent one.

I want to give you a little history of the appropriations for this committee. The Dies committee was authorized in 1938, January 9. We have appropriated \$385,000 since that time. This resolution will make the total appropriations \$495,000.

As I have said, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] requested \$300,000, and your Committee on Accounts has recommended \$110,000.

Now, in answer to the gentleman from Montana, I will say that the Accounts Committee has instructed me not to yield for an amendment to this resolution.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me for another question?

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield to me to offer an amendment to reduce this amount to \$35,000?

Mr. COCHRAN. I have just said that I have been instructed by the Accounts Committee not to yield for an amendment, and I will abide by the instructions.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Then the gentleman declines to yield for that purpose? I want to offer that amendment.

Mr. COCHRAN. I do.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Is the gentleman going to yield some time for debate?

Mr. COCHRAN. I am going to yield time to those who have asked for it.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, has the Committee on Accounts ever recommended an appropriation as large as \$385,000 to any committee?

Mr. COCHRAN. No. This is the largest appropriation that any committee of the House has ever had. It covers the period from June 9, 1938, to January 3, 1943.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Will the gentleman tell the House who is paying for the printing of the Dies hearings and the reports and other matters that they have printed? Is that coming out of the funds appropriated to the Dies committee, or is the Congress or the Government or the American people paying additional sums for the printing of all the material that has been sent out in the last 4 years?

Mr. COCHRAN. The charge for reporting the hearings is paid out of this fund. The cost of printing comes out of the general printing fund.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. And the cost for printing covers about \$80,000 or \$90,000 besides.

Mr. COCHRAN. I do not know, I could not agree with the gentleman, but I doubt very much if it is that much. I

do not control that appropriation; the Clerk of the House handles it.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The last figure I got was \$70,000.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, unless someone has a question to ask, I have nothing further to say, except that the Accounts Committee is following the mandate of the House by bringing in this resolution. It is up to the House now to decide what it desires to do.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN].

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I call attention to the fact that during the life of the original McCormack committee, from about 1934 to 1936, we were the pioneers of this investigation. We worked hard; we had fine investigators; and all we ever got from this Congress was \$30,000. We got along for over a year and a half on that amount, and then we returned some of the money to the Treasury of the United States. I believe there is not a Member on this floor who can question the fine work of the McCormack committee, because when we got through, we actually presented constructive propositions, and we were responsible for the passage of the Registration Act, requiring the registration of agents of foreign nations, and with the help of this law the Department of Justice today is able to procure convictions of enemy agents in every city in this country. The McCormack committee did not have as many investigators as the Dies committee has had, but we did a good job for that amount of money, for a year and a half. The Dies committee has already gotten \$385,000, and you are now going to give them another \$110,000. I say \$385,000, and this does not include the salary of reporters in the District of Columbia, which the committee does not have to pay out of its own funds, and it does not include the money spent for the printing of a great number of publications which in my opinion have absolutely no value other than to keep the Dies committee before the public eye. The American people are paying hundreds of thousands of dollars for the printing of such publications. It seems to me that the activities of the Dies committee in the past have given us no reason to suppose that in voting for another appropriation we are protecting our country against subversive activities and sabotage. The committee has done very little constructive work along these lines, and the Department of Justice and the F. B. I. are doing all the work which the Dies committee was supposed to do. Thank the Lord we have a J. Edgar Hoover and a Justice Department to rely upon in these critical times.

I have no use for communism, but to call people Reds without giving them an opportunity to be heard is unfair and unbecoming a congressional committee. I have nothing against the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES]. I admire him and I admire every member of that committee. They started off all right, but, in view of the fact that they have not submitted to this Congress, or the last Congress, or the Congress before, any constructive legislation that would destroy the fifth or the

sixth columns in this country, I think we should pause a moment before granting them this amount. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, it is about time that we stop wasting the taxpayers' money.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I was one of those who voted for a continuation of this committee, but when I read in the newspaper what you all read, what the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] did with information that he received as to certain Communists in the employ of the Government, and how he gave it to the newspapers instead of giving it to the Vice President, Mr. WALLACE, who heads the committee attacked by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], or the Department of Justice, I regretted my action in so voting. I regard the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] very highly. His patriotism cannot be questioned, but I do not like the way he is doing. I think he is one of the greatest orators I have ever listened to. I have seen him nearly sweep this House off its feet. I also think he has done a lot of good work and dug up a lot of good information, but there are different ways of handling this information. If he has secured information of value to our country during these times, and it is the kind of information that should be given to the Department of Justice, then that is where it should be given, not to the newspapers first.

Furthermore, this committee does not function as a committee. It is the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES]. He ignores the remainder of the committee. The public does not know who the other members are. I know I might just as well talk against the wind as to talk against this resolution, because it will be passed. Arbitrarily I have been denied the right to offer an amendment to this resolution. We must either vote it up or down; and, of course, I know it will be passed. But I will express my views in the hope that they might be helpful.

Maybe it would not be important whether the entire committee functioned or not if the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] proceeded along the line expected of him by the House who voted his authority; but what has he done? The record indisputably shows that he has gone down to the State of Texas and there proposes to hold his hearings. I certainly have no objection to the State of Texas. Next to my own State of Montana, it is about one of the best in the Union. Does this procedure conform to the practice and dignity of the House of Representatives, whose place of business is at the Capitol in Washington, D. C.? Every Member of this House has a part in this procedure. It is not Mr. DIES' committee. It is a committee of the House. It is your committee and my committee. We cannot blink what is going on. We cannot evade our responsibility by being blind. Nobody will doubt but what we are faced with the most critical crisis that ever confronted our country. We cannot and must not be

a party or give our official sanction to any words or action that would tend to divide or disunite our people. Divide and destroy is Hitler's method. Of course, you may go back further in history and find that that has always been the hand and plan of the conquerors of other nations. We have a common purpose with the nations who today are opposing the Axis forces. As so well pointed out by the Attorney General, we have the F. B. I. and the Navy and Army Intelligence Services. They are experienced investigators. Among them are few, if any tyros. Let us not bungle the job. I quote from what the Attorney General said, as quoted by the Associated Press:

Attorney General Biddle said yesterday—

This was the 18th of this month—

in connection with plans of Representative DIES, of Texas, to hold hearings at Jasper, Tex., on Nazi spy activities, that "I think it always a pity to have amateur investigations of espionage."

Asked at a press conference about DIES' announced intention, the Attorney General said:

"We have three large investigative services—the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Navy and Army Intelligence Services. They have been cooperating perfectly and are in daily contact. I think it is always a pity to have amateur investigations of espionage, whether by Mr. DIES or anyone else. It needs trained, coordinated, responsible action."

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I submit that, despite the House vote last March for continuing the life of the Dies committee, we must pass on this appropriation in accordance with the times and circumstances in which we find ourselves and on the question of the usefulness of the Dies committee itself in the winning of this war. I say that, despite the vote on the Dies resolution in March, we are duty-bound to vote down this appropriation if we find that the Dies committee impedes the war effort. I am directing my remarks especially to those who voted for the Dies resolution last month and I call their attention to certain irrefutable and uncontradicted evidence which proves conclusively that this committee on its record has been and is interfering with the successful prosecution of our war against the fifth column.

I submit proof to you that its efforts and its activities are contrary to the best interests of the war effort.

Surely, as responsible Representatives of the people, if we feel that the aims and actions of this committee are contrary to the best interests of the war effort, then it is our solemn duty to vote against any appropriation, despite the action of the House during the month of March.

I call to your attention an article which I have in my hand, published in a newspaper called *Enterprise*, of Beaumont, Tex., dated April 18, 1942. As far as I know this is the only paper in which this news story appears. It is published

in Mr. DIES' district. In this article Mr. DIES is quoted as saying as follows:

If anyone's an amateur in this business—

Get this, please, because it is very important—

If anyone's an amateur in this business it's the Federal Bureau of Investigation. My committee has been making investigations for 4 years, and the Federal Bureau of Investigation only admitted a year ago that there might be a fifth-column problem in the United States. Before that they ridiculed the idea.

Mr. Biddle has never been sympathetic to our committee, but he never hesitates to get his evidence from us and he keeps 3 Federal Bureau of Investigation men permanently stationed in our committee's office. We have on record 1,145 requests from the Federal Bureau of Investigation for evidence. Conviction of 984 persons the last 12 months came as a result of being exposed by the Un-American Activities Committee.

They didn't give us any credit for it, but anyone who wants to make an investigation will see that the convictions were on our evidence.

I have made an investigation. I communicated with the Department of Justice. The Department of Justice has informed me that this statement is entirely untrue—absolutely untrue. Further than that, there is now in the possession of Mr. J. Edgar Hoover a letter or a telegram, I do not remember the form, in which Mr. DIES has informed Mr. Hoover that he has asked the Beaumont *Enterprise* to retract this statement which is contained in this article.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. You will note that Mr. DIES also states in the same article that the F. B. I. had three of their men permanently stationed in the Dies committee office. The Department of Justice has informed me that this statement also is absolutely untrue. That statement has also been retracted by Mr. DIES himself, according to the message sent to Mr. Hoover. In the same news article Mr. DIES reiterates his intention to do the committee's business on his own ranch, deep in the heart of Jasper, Tex. This information shocked the American people. It should shock the American Congress.

Now, what does this latest antic of Mr. DIES mean? It means throwing a monkey wrench into the law-enforcement agency which is conducting our war against the enemy Axis agents and fifth columnists in the United States. If the chairman of the committee can recklessly make those statements and then retract them after the damage is done at a time as perilous as this, then I say this \$110,000 is not a contribution in the furtherance of our war effort, but I say it is a contribution against the best interests of our war effort. It is a contribution to disunity, to division, and, above all, to the undermining of our Nation's war machinery.

Let us look a little more closely at the Dies allegation contained in this same article that 95 percent of the convictions obtained by the F. B. I. against German agents were obtained as a result of the

activities of the Dies committee. As I have stated, the Department of Justice brands it as completely false. Mr. DIES is now forced to retract it.

The Dies committee was created to investigate un-American propaganda. The grand jury which has been sitting in Washington for the past few months has called before it many important and notorious witnesses. It has indeed been investigating un-American propaganda and un-American activities. Yet not one of these witnesses before this grand jury was ever summoned before the Dies committee for exposure. The grand jury heard evidence about the far-flung system of un-American publications which are being circulated in this country. Yet not one of the editors, owners, or backers of these un-American publications has ever been summoned before the Dies committee for exposure. In fact, the very existence of this special grand jury is eloquent testimony to the fact that the Dies committee in its 4 years of existence and with its \$385,000 has failed miserably to do the job assigned to it, and it is other Government agencies which are now efficiently engaged in ferreting out these enemy agents and their domestic lackeys.

In this same issue of the Beaumont (Tex.) *Enterprise*, Mr. DIES is quoted as saying that he could find only five editorials throughout the country which expressed approval of Vice President WALLACE's rebuke of the Dies committee. This strikes me as being on the humorous side. The chairman of a committee whose job is one of investigation can only find five editorials which support Mr. WALLACE, whereas a phone call from my office to the Division of Press Intelligence reveals that even a quick check of editorials in leading newspapers shows 64 as vigorously attacking the Dies committee for its smear of the Board of Economic Warfare. I am afraid that Mr. DIES' research in the field of editorial comment is on the same level as his committee's research on un-American activities.

We are now considering whether to appropriate an additional \$110,000 for the work of the Dies committee.

If we do so, there will be a great rejoicing in at least two quarters of the enemy camp.

There will be rejoicing in Berlin, which will congratulate itself on the fact that it will continue to have the opportunity of making use of the statements and work of the Dies committee, its chairman, and its investigators. In another speech I have shown you how the Goebbels short wave radios quote Mr. DIES' statements with approbation. The Nazis will also be happy to know, for example, that the \$7,200 investigator for the Dies committee, J. B. Matthews, is still around. For they have found his statements most useful. In fact, as I revealed before the Committee on Accounts, Herr Goebbels' personal publication, *Contra Komintern*, which is used to spread Nazi propaganda within Germany and throughout the world, found the testimony of Matthews before the Dies committee of such importance to them that they printed it in full, devoting large sections of three issues of this publication to it. *Contra Komintern* would regret to see the Dies

committee deprived of an appropriation since, as the chief publication medium for the Nazi total espionage system, the magazine has made ample use of the words of the chief investigator for the Dies committee. Its boss, Mr. Goebbels, would likewise regret to see Mr. Dies deprived of this appropriation and thus lose the usefulness of the American public official frequently and favorably quoted by him in his radio propaganda attacks against America.

And there will be rejoicing in our own country among such groups as the Ku Klux Klan, which in various States has openly joined with the Nazi Bund in attacks upon our American institutions. The Imperial Wizard of this pernicious, un-American gang will consider his work well done if the Dies committee receives an appropriation. On January 27 of this year, as reported in *The Fiery Cross*, official organ of the Ku Klux Klan, this Imperial Wizard ordered all Klan members to campaign for the continuation of the Dies committee, since, said he:

The committee has rendered a great service to our country.

The great service to which the Imperial Wizard referred was the fair and courteous treatment which the Dies committee accorded the head of this subversive organization.

Therefore, again I say that to appropriate \$110,000 for the work of this committee is to appropriate funds against the best interests of our war effort.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox].

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I have no quarrel to make with our friends who do not like the Dies committee. They probably feel they have a just grievance. Certainly they have the right to criticize. I have the conviction, however, that the Dies committee has rendered a very valuable service to the country, and I am glad to say so. It is possible that the committee has done an injustice to some by classifying them as Communists, fifth columnists, and so forth. If this is so, it is to be regretted, but it was not malicious or with intention to embarrass. We all make mistakes, but we make no mistake to say the country as a whole is heartily behind this committee. The people feel that this committee has rendered a great service.

Replying specifically to the argument of the gentleman from New York, which was to the effect that the work of this committee is no contribution to the war effort and might as well be suspended, it might be said that the activity of the "new orderites" is no contribution to the war effort. If they should cease their efforts to make over the country, then we might suspend the investigations being carried on by this committee; but they are still boring away and as long as they are active in behalf of making over America there is work for the Dies committee to do. I hope this House will evidence its appreciation of this committee by voting overwhelmingly for the reso-

lution which the chairman of the Committee on Accounts offers.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Eliot].

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, since the Dies committee was extended on March 11, three events have happened which make me feel that it would be unwise to give them the appropriation that has been recommended: First, there was the reckless and largely unsubstantiated attack by the chairman of the committee upon a vital war agency. Second, there was the announcement of the chairman of that committee that he personally was going to smash the Nazi spy ring—I quote him—by holding hearings in Texas. As has been pointed out here today and as has been pointed out by the Attorney General counterespionage is desperately serious business and is being handled and should be handled by the trained and responsible agencies of the administrative branch of the Government. Third, in these last 6 weeks a number of newspapers and at least one national magazine have given the country what we have a right to expect the Dies committee to give us. They have printed exposés of the most dangerous fifth-column operation now in this country on behalf of our enemies. They have named the names of organizations and of those filthy sheets called "the vermin press" by one of the reporters, which are really trying to contribute to disunity and defeat here in America. The Dies committee has not done anything about these real un-American activities at all. For these reasons, regardless of our vote in March, it seems to me that the record of the last month of the Dies committee and its chairman is such as to justify a denial of further appropriations.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Klein] to make an observation.

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, my record in opposition to the work of this committee is very clear. I appeared on the floor and argued against the extension of the life of the committee, and I appeared before the Accounts Committee in opposition to the appropriation. I am still opposed to it, and for one particular reason: We are now at war. This committee may have served some purpose during peacetime, but now that we are at war, we need unity among our people. The work of this committee, and particularly of its chairman is having the opposite effect; it is disuniting our people, it is arraying class against class, and force against force. This does not help our war effort, and in fact, is impeding it. Our people must be united, at this time, particularly. We have law-enforcement agencies in this country, the Department of Justice and the F. B. I., that can do the work this committee is attempting, and do it much better without publicizing any particular individual, and without building up anybody. This bureau is in charge of J. Edgar Hoover who has done a marvelous job, and I am sure he

will continue his good work. Certainly, it is better to have a man of this type directing the work of tracking down subversive groups and others guilty of sabotage and pro-Axis activities, than for it to be done by any amateur group, no matter how zealous they may be. For this reason I urge you to vote down the resolution.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, your Committee on Accounts bases this amount upon a deficit of about \$10,000 and an additional \$100,000. The committee feels this will be sufficient to enable the committee to function as it has in the last 3 or 4 months, and should last until January 3, 1943, when the life of the Dies committee expires.

Mr. Speaker, every Member who has asked for time has been recognized. It is now the duty of the House to vote on the resolution as I will not use any additional time.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MARCANTONIO) there were—ayes 109, noes 31.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 291, nays 64, answered "present" 1, not voting 75, as follows:

[Roll No. 53]

YEAS—291

Allen, Ill.	Buck	Dewey
Allen, La.	Burch	Dirksen
Andersen,	Butler	Domengaux
H. Carl	Camp	Dondero
Anderson, Calif.	Canfield	Doughton
Anderson,	Cannon, Mo.	Douglas
N. Mex.	Capozzoli	Drewry
Andresen,	Carlson	Duncan
August H.	Carter	Durham
Andrews	Cartwright	Dwornshak
Angell	Casey, Mass.	Eaton
Arends	Chapman	Edmiston
Barden	Chenoweth	Elliott, Calif.
Barnes	Chipherfield	Elston
Barry	Claypool	Engel
Bates, Mass.	Clevenger	Englebright
Baumhart	Cluett	Faddis
Beam	Cochran	Fellows
Beckworth	Coffee, Nebr.	Fenton
Beiter	Cole, N. Y.	Fish
Bell	Collins	Flaherty
Bender	Colmer	Flannagan
Bennett	Cocley	Ford, Le'and M.
Bishop	Cooper	Ford, Miss.
Bland	Copeland	Fulmer
Boehne	Costello	Gamble
Boggs	Courtney	Gathings
Boland	Cox	Gavagan
Bolton	Cravens	Gearhart
Bonner	Crawford	Gehrman
Boren	Cunningham	Gerlach
Boykin	Curtis	Gibson
Brooks	D'Alesandro	Gilchrist
Brown, Ga.	Davis, Ohio	Gillette
Brown, Ohio	Davis, Tenn.	Gillie
Bryson	Day	Gore

Gossett	McKeough	Sasser
Graham	McLaughlin	Satterfield
Grant, Ind.	McLean	Sauthoff
Gregory	McMillan	Schuetz
Guyre	Maas	Scott
Gwynne	Mahon	Scrugham
Hall	Manasco	Secrest
Edwin Arthur	Mansfield	Sheppard
Hall	Martin, Iowa	Short
Leonard W.	Martin, Mass.	Simpson
Halleck	May	Smith, Maine
Hancock	Meyer, Md.	Smith, Va.
Hare	Mills, Ark.	Smith, Wis.
Harris, Ark.	Mills, La.	Snyder
Harris, Va.	Monroney	South
Hart	Moser	Sparkman
Harter	Mott	Spence
Hartley	Mundt	Springer
Healey	Murdoch	Steagall
Hébert	Murray	Stearns, N. H.
Heldinger	Nelson	Stefan
Hess	Nichols	Stevenson
Hill, Colo.	Norrell	Stratton
Hinsshaw	Norton	Sullivan
Hobbs	O'Brien, N. Y.	Sumner, Ill.
Hope	O'Hara	Sutphin
Howell	Oliver	Taber
Hull	O'Neal	Talbot
Hunter	O'Toole	Talle
Imhoff	Pace	Tarver
Jacobsen	Paddock	Tenerowicz
Jenkins, Ohio	Patman	Terry
Jenks, N. H.	Patton	Thill
Jennings	Pearson	Thom
Jensen	Peterson, Ga.	Thomas, N. J.
Johns	Pittenger	Thomas, Tex.
Johnson, Calif.	Plauché	Thomason
Johnson, Ill.	Ploeser	Tibbott
Johnson, Ind.	Plumley	Tinkham
Johnson	Poage	Treadway
Luther A.	Powers	Van Zandt
Johnson, Okla.	Priest	Vincent, Ky.
Jones	Randolph	Vinson, Ga.
Jonkman	Rankin, Miss.	Voorhis, Calif.
Kean	Reece, Tenn.	Vorys, Ohio
Keefe	Reed, Ill.	Wadsworth
Kefauver	Reed, N. Y.	Ward
Kelly, Ill.	Rees, Kans.	Wene
Kilburn	Rich	Wheat
Kilday	Richards	Wheelchel
Kinzer	Rivers	Whitten
Kleberg	Rizley	Whittington
Knutson	Robertson	Wickersham
Lambertson	N. Dak.	Wigglesworth
Lane	Robertson, Va.	Williams
Lanham	Robinson, Utah	Winter
Larrabee	Robson, Ky.	Wolcott
Lea	Rockefeller	Wolfenden, Pa.
LeCompte	Rockwell	Wolverton, N. J.
Lewis	Rodgers, Pa.	Woodruff, Mich.
Lynch	Rogers, Okla.	Youngdahl
McCormack	Roip	Zimmerman
McGehee	Russell	
McGregor	Sanders	

NAYS—64

Baldwin	Haines	Mitchell
Bates, Ky.	Hill, Wash.	O'Brien, Mich.
Bradley, Pa.	Holbrook	O'Connor
Bulwinkle	Hook	O'Leary
Burdick	Houston	Pheiffer
Burgin	Izac	William T.
Celler	Jackson	Pierce
Coffee, Wash.	Johnson, W. Va.	Rabaut
Crowther	Kee	Ramsay
Delaney	Kelley, Pa.	Sacks
Dickstein	Kennedy	Scanlon
Dingell	Martin J.	Schulte
Downs	Keogh	Shanley
Eberhart	Kirwan	Sheridan
Elliot, Mass.	Klein	Smith, Wash.
Fitzgerald	Kopplemann	Somers, N. Y.
Fogarty	Leavy	Traynor
Folger	Lesinski	Wasielowski
Forand	McGranery	Weaver
Ford, Thomas F.	McIntyre	Weiss
Gale	Maciora	Wright
Granger	Marcantonio	Young

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Arnold

NOT VOTING—75

Blackney	Creal	Harness
Bloom	Crosser	Harrington
Bradley, Mich.	Culkin	Heffernan
Buckler, Minn.	Cullen	Hendricks
Buckley, N. Y.	Dies	Hoffman
Byrne	Disney	Holmes
Byron	Ditter	Jarman
Cannon, Fla.	Ellis	Jarrett
Case, S. Dak.	Fitzpatrick	Johnson
Clark	Gifford	Lyndon B.
Clason	Grant, Ala.	Kennedy
Cole, Md.	Green	Michael J.

Kerr	Patrick	Smith, Pa.
Kocialkowski	Peterson, Fla.	Smith, W. Va.
Kramer	Pfeifer	Starnes, Ala.
Kunkel	Joseph L.	Summers, Tex.
Landis	Ramspeck	Sweeney
Ludlow	Rankin, Mont.	Tolan
Maclejewski	Rogers, Mass.	Vreeland
Magnuson	Romjue	Walter
Mason	Sabath	Welch
Merritt	Schaefer, Ill.	West
Michener	Shafer, Mich.	White
Myers, Pa.	Shannon	Wilson
O'Day	Sikes	Woodrum, Va.
Osmer	Smith, Ohio	Worley

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Michener for, with Mr. Clark against.
Mrs. Rogers of Massachusetts for, with Mrs. O'Day against.

Mr. Shafer of Michigan for, with Miss Rankin of Montana against.

General pairs:

Mr. Cole of Maryland with Mr. Blackney.
Mr. Starnes of Alabama with Mr. Hoffman.
Mr. Woodrum of Virginia with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.Mr. Ramspeck with Mr. Welch.
Mr. Grant of Alabama with Mr. Landis.
Mr. Hendricks with Mr. Smith of Ohio.
Mr. Creal with Mr. Gifford.
Mr. Kerr with Mr. Ditter.
Mr. Cannon of Florida with Mr. Mason.
Mr. Michael J. Kennedy with Mr. Holmes.
Mr. Dies with Mr. Culkin.
Mr. Cullen with Mr. Kunkel.
Mr. Patrick with Mr. Clason.
Mr. Fitzpatrick with Mr. Osmer.
Mr. Green with Mr. Harness.
Mr. Summers of Texas with Mr. Wilson.
Mr. West with Mr. Jarrett.
Mr. Crosser with Mr. Vreeland.
Mr. Ellis with Mr. Buckler of Minnesota.
Mr. Bloom with Mr. Sikes.
Mr. Peterson of Florida with Mr. Smith of West Virginia.

Mr. Lyndon B. Johnson with Mr. Schaefer of Illinois.

Mr. Buckley of New York with Mr. Harrington.

Mr. Joseph L. Pfeifer with Mrs. Byron.
Mr. Romjue with Mr. Byrne.
Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Worley.
Mr. Ludlow with Mr. Merritt.
Mr. Walter with Mr. Disney.
Mr. Maciejewski with Mr. Smith of Pennsylvania.Mr. Kramer with Mr. Sweeney.
Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Sabath.
Mr. Kocialkowski with Mr. Myers.

The doors were opened.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAUL A. LARNED

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk Senate Concurrent Resolution 28, and its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. May]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the action of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and of the Vice President in signing the enrolled bill (S. 2202) to reinstate Paul A. Larned, a major, United States Army, retired, to the active list of Regular Army is hereby rescinded;**Resolved further, That the action of the Senate and the House of Representatives in passing the said bill is hereby vacated.*

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 15 seconds.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK?]

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in addition to the announcement I previously made about business on tomorrow, I want to announce to the House that an appropriation bill out of the Appropriations Committee to construct defense housing in the District of Columbia, which I understand is noncontroversial, will be brought up for consideration on tomorrow, also.

RELIEF OF DEALERS IN CERTAIN ARTICLES OR COMMODITIES RATIONED UNDER AUTHORITY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 6761; and pending that motion, I ask unanimous consent that the bill S. 2315, for the relief of dealers in certain articles or commodities rationed under authority of the United States, may be considered in lieu of the House bill, the bills being identical.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL]?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman is calling up H. R. 6761?

Mr. STEAGALL. I did not get the gentleman's question.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I understand that the gentleman is calling up H. R. 6761.

Mr. STEAGALL. That is correct.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The bill that I understood was to be called up is a bill reported out of the committee, reintroduced yesterday, H. R. 6995.

Mr. STEAGALL. If I have the number wrong, I am glad the gentleman called my attention to it. I merely referred to the original number, and I thank the gentleman. I asked unanimous consent to consider the Senate bill, S. 2315, which is identical with the bill reported to the House by the Banking and Currency Committee.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I understand that the bill H. R. 6995 is identical with S. 2315 as it passed the Senate yesterday.

Mr. STEAGALL. Quite correct. The bills are identical.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL].

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the con-

sideration of the bill S. 2315, with Mr. BARDEN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under a previous order, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL] is recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, this bill is identical with the bill reported to the House by a unanimous vote of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The difficulties which automobile dealers and others find themselves, resulting from orders of restriction, rationing, and freezing in order to carry out the emergency program of the Government, difficulties which seem to be recognized on all hands, call for such relief as can be afforded only by legislative enactment. It is the purpose of this bill to permit loans and purchases for the relief of this class of our citizens, who have stocks of commodities on hand which they are not permitted to sell. Yet expenses, rents, and all incident to expenses of handling these commodities, accumulate continuously. This in brief is the purpose of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, the bill was introduced in the House by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], who has given considerable study to the problem confronting small business concerns. In view of the splendid work he has done in connection with the bill and his familiarity with it, I shall not discuss the measure further at this time. I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

AUTOMOBILE DEALERS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, the bill we are now considering is S. 2315. It is the same as my bill, H. R. 6995, in the House. It passed the Senate on yesterday. If you will turn to page 3696 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday, Monday, April 27, 1942, you will find where the discussion on the bill commences. The bill was thoroughly and fully discussed in the Senate.

As introduced in the House, the bill was not exactly like the bill that was pending in the Senate. The Senate made some changes in committee and the House Committee on Banking and Currency made some changes in committee. Yesterday the Senate accepted the amendments the House committee had adopted, and the House committee had theretofore accepted and adopted the amendments agreed upon by the Senate committee, so the bill H. R. 6995 is identical with the bill S. 2315 that passed the Senate on yesterday.

COMMITTEES ON SMALL BUSINESS

This bill is an outgrowth and result of the work of the Committees on Small Business in the Senate and in the House. Both of these committees have been working on these problems for several months. The House Committee on Small Business, composed of Representatives BULWINKLE, KELLY of Illinois, FITZGERALD, HALLECK, LEONARD W. HALL, FLOESER, and myself, chairman, gave ex-

tensive hearings to the automobile dealers and tire dealers. There were automobile dealers here from every State, hundreds of them. We heard every representative of the automobile dealers who desired to be heard, and even heard individual dealers not connected with any association who desired to express their views. They left here with the feeling that they would receive sympathetic consideration from this Congress, and they have received it. They are entitled to that consideration, because the automobile dealers and the tire dealers were the first to feel what the President of the United States called yesterday "equality of privilege."

The automobile dealers came before us and said, "We are not complaining, we are not protesting, we are not objecting. If it is necessary to put us out of business, it will be perfectly all right. We believe this war comes first. It means in many cases the destruction of our businesses, it means taking away our lifetime savings, it means everything to us, but the war comes first. We are willing to make any sacrifice that is necessary for us to make in order to contribute our part toward the winning of this war."

I have never known a group to manifest a finer spirit of patriotism than the automobile dealers and others who are affected by the drastic regulations which it was absolutely necessary to make in order to conserve the civilian supply of automobiles, tires, and other commodities, and also for the purpose of converting the huge, immense automobile factories into factories to make the war products necessary to the prosecution of this war.

Many people were not convinced at first that this rationing was necessary, but I believe every informed person today is absolutely convinced that the fair and sensible and right thing was done in the rationing of automobiles, tires, and other commodities affected by this bill.

Since these regulations were introduced, 44,000 automobile dealers in the United States of America have had their stocks of cars absolutely frozen. Their money has been invested in these cars. Many of the dealers have not only paid for the cars by securing loans from banks but are paying interest on the money they have borrowed to pay for these cars. They are paying for the upkeep of the cars and are servicing them and keeping them in proper condition. They are keeping them well stored and preserved and protected from the hazards of the weather. I believe they are rendering a real Government service.

People who are doing that at their own expense and at their own risk, and most of whom will be put out of business, should certainly receive the sympathetic consideration of the Congress of the United States, and that is exactly what this bill is intended to do. It is intended to give them an opportunity to get their money out of these automobiles.

This does not mean the Government will lose. The Government will not necessarily lose 1 penny, but it is possible for the Government to lose some money.

This is not a bill for the relief of the automobile dealers, because it is not a relief bill. It should not be considered in that category at all. It should be considered as a bill to grant what the Constitution of the United States says, in a small measure, at least, compensation to one whose property has been taken by reason of laws passed by Congress. So it is a bill for security or compensation and not a bill for relief.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. The gentleman says this is not a bill for relief, but in section 5h (a) it is stated:

In order to prevent and relieve distress among dealers.

How, then, can the gentleman say this is not a relief bill?

Mr. PATMAN. In this bill the word "relief" is used, but I am telling the gentleman now it is not a relief bill as one might refer to a W. P. A. bill or something like that. I refer to it as a bill to grant compensation to automobile dealers.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. What rate of interest will these dealers have to pay the Reconstruction Finance Corporation?

Mr. PATMAN. I do not believe the interest rate is fixed by the bill, but the rate will be reasonable, we are assured.

Mr. DONDERO. There is nothing in the bill about that?

Mr. PATMAN. No; but it will be a very reasonable rate, as the R. F. C. has the policy of making the rates low.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman in the course of his discussion make clear just exactly what subsection 1 and subsection 4 of section 5h (a) really mean?

I confess that after reading the debates in the Senate and reading these two sections, I am very much confused, and I would like to ask the gentleman if it is his understanding as this bill is written that an automobile dealer with a stock of cars on his hands may wait 18 months from and after January 1, 1942, before relief can be extended to him under the terms of this act.

Mr. PATMAN. No; loans may be granted before that time.

Mr. KEEFE. At what time?

Mr. PATMAN. But the R. F. C. is not compelled to make any loans or any purchase before 18 months from January 1, 1942.

Mr. KEEFE. Then I understand the language of the bill is to the effect that the R. F. C. may make loans in advance of the 18-month period.

Mr. PATMAN. They may make loans now or as soon as this bill becomes law.

Mr. KEEFE. But they are not compelled to do it until after the dealers have had those stocks on hand for 18 months

after the rationing order went into effect?

Mr. PATMAN. That is right.

Mr. KEEFE. How does the gentleman interpret paragraph 1 relating to the 6 months?

Mr. PATMAN. That is in relation to the article rationed. The word "automobile," I do not believe, is used here. This refers to all commodities that come within the terms of the bill, and the 6-month provision relates to a definition of the rationing order that would cause the article to come within the terms of the act.

Mr. KEEFE. Would the gentleman consider the automobile freezing order as "rationing," as defined in this act?

Mr. PATMAN. Absolutely; I think the gentleman's interpretation is correct.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. Can the gentleman tell me just what the condition of the tires in these stocks after 18 months have elapsed and they have been sitting around in storage will be?

Mr. PATMAN. Necessarily, they will not be as good. But, of course, most of the cars will be moved in 6 months.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I would like to ask the gentleman this question. As I understand this measure, it proposes that the R. F. C. will make loans to automobile dealers in order to let them carry their stocks and protect them over a period of months.

Mr. PATMAN. That is right.

Mr. MAY. I thought the committee would bring in a bill that would lift these restrictions and allow them to sell their stocks on hand to their customers and save the Government from having to lend money and let them take care of their own business which they could do. We are not manufacturing cars and they would find a ready market.

Mr. PATMAN. I thoroughly agree that that would be a convenient and easy way, and, maybe, the most economical way, but there are other factors to be considered, and the main factor is one with which the gentleman has as much to do as any other man in Congress today, and by reason of those factors it is not considered wise to do what the gentleman suggests.

Mr. MAY. Is it desired by the War or Navy Departments to have some of these cars, and if so, why do they not buy and pay for them?

Mr. PATMAN. They will be doing that every day, I think.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman, I believe, has a good bill, and I am for it. I notice on page 4 of the bill there is a provision that in the event the property itself does not bring sufficient to pay off the loan with interest, there will be no deficiency claim against the borrower.

Mr. PATMAN. That is conditioned upon but one thing, and that is if a price is fixed by the Price Administrator which would interfere with it.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I think that is a very good provision.

Mr. PATMAN. Oh, yes. You see, if a borrower abuses the security or permits it to deteriorate unnecessarily, he could be charged with that, but if there is a loss solely by reason of the price fixed by a Government official, then that difference should not be held against the man obtaining the loan.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I will say to the gentleman that I am very much in favor of his bill.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I want to ask the gentleman whether I am correct in my interpretation of that 6 months' provision about which the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] asked. As I understand it, the purpose of the bill is to limit its operations to commodities in the case of which it would not be possible for the dealer in that commodity to dispose of stocks that he has on hand within a 6 months' period. In other words, if sugar dealers were being rationed, it would be natural to suppose that retail dealers would sell all the sugar they had on hand at the time the rationing began.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. So it would not affect them but would affect people like automobile dealers.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; and tire dealers and dealers in refrigerators, and things of that sort.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I would also like to ask the gentleman the relation between paragraph 3 and paragraph 4, because paragraph 3 states that "such purchases and loans shall be made on a basis which will enable any such dealer to secure for any such article or commodity which he has on hand an amount not less than its cost to him," while paragraph 4 states—

Mr. PATMAN. Wait—"plus a reasonable allowance," and so forth.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Plus certain charges, that is right, but paragraph 4 puts it on the basis of a fair retail price. Why do you have both of those provisions and what is the relation of one to the other?

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman will notice that paragraph 4 relates to the 18 months' provision, where it is compulsory after 18 months, and it is separate and distinct from paragraph 3, which is optional between now and 18 months.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. I have great admiration for the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], but when I first read this bill it directed the R. F. C. to make these loans.

Mr. PATMAN. That is correct.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Afterward the direction was eliminated, and it was made permissive. In the light of the experiences that we have all had, it seems to me that making it permissive vitiated the purposes that the gentleman and I had in mind to help those industries.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I know the point the gentleman is making. I concede that when the bill was introduced in the House and in the Senate it carried a provision that the R. F. C. was directed to make these loans, but the hearings developed certain testimony that caused both committees to unanimously change their minds, because this applies to everything, not only automobiles, refrigerators, and tires, but to everything—something in the future, and we do not know what it will apply to. Therefore we are not willing to tie our hands on something we cannot see in the future, and we left it up to the Administrator, and authorized him, with the understanding that he would consider this a mandate of the Congress and absolutely carry it out in letter and spirit.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Just one other question. Among those who asked for this change was the Chairman of the R. F. C., Mr. Jones?

Mr. PATMAN. Certainly. He would be the logical one to point out to us the defects, and he did point them out, and every member of the committee agreed with him.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. I shall vote for the bill, but with great misgivings, because of the change I refer to.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I commend my colleague for what he and his committee have done in drafting a bill to meet the needs so prevalent throughout the United States. I ask this question: What time limit is placed with reference to the sale or the disposition of these cars?

Mr. PATMAN. Eighteen months. In other words, if they are not disposed of within that time, the Government will purchase them or make loans upon them.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. PACE. The gentleman stated to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] awhile ago, as I understood, that loans could be made today.

Mr. PATMAN. When this bill passes; yes.

Mr. PACE. As I read the bill, it says that to become eligible you must have a commodity which is not normally moved within 6 months.

Mr. PATMAN. No; one that will not normally move within that time. For instance, sugar, as suggested by the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS], will normally move quickly to consumers in 6 months. Therefore the bill would not apply to it but would apply to automobiles which have been rationed which would not move so quickly.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. I rise simply to compliment the gentleman from Texas upon bringing this bill into the House. It is very much needed.

Mr. PATMAN. I thank the gentleman, but it is the Committee on Banking and Currency that does this.

Mr. SHEPPARD. What is the position of the dealer who has his cars frozen for this year's carry? How is he going to be relieved of the amount of money to be expended?

Mr. PATMAN. That is to be taken into consideration. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman sits down, I would like to know how this bill will relieve small factories, iron workers, and furnace factories that manufacture different kinds of articles?

Mr. PATMAN. Oh, the gentleman has a different bill in mind. The bill he refers to is the one which the House committee is now considering, and the one that the Senate has already passed, to set up a corporation for smaller manufacturing concerns. I think that bill will be in soon. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes. Personally, I am somewhat disappointed in this bill because I believe it contains some inconsistencies and possibly some incongruities. I believe that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has authority at the present time to do everything that this bill contemplates in its present form. However, Mr. Jones, before the Senate committee, announced that if this policy were reenacted he would consider it—and I am quoting the substance of his remarks and not verbatim—a mandate to carry out the legislative policy. That statement has been interpreted by Mr. Bishop, of the American Automobile Dealers' Association, to be an unequivocal promise on the part of Mr. Jones that the automobile dealers would get relief under this bill, and, although they would have preferred to have the bill directive instead of being a mere authorization, they have accepted the statement made by Mr. Jones, and, if they are satisfied, we should be satisfied.

During the hearings I brought up the question and I asked Mr. Bishop about these different things. The testimony is from page 30 on, in part II, of the unrevised committee print of the hearings. In part, it is as follows:

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Bishop, as I understand the Senate bill, as reported out, the purchase or loan of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall be made on the basis which will enable him under certain conditions to receive not less than a fair retail price as fixed by the Price Control Administrator for such article or commodity. Now, that preserves in the Office of Price Administration the authority of completely nullifying the purpose of this act, does it not?

Mr. BISHOP. That would be possible; yes, sir.

Mr. WOLCOTT. In section (a) the Senate has authorized the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, either directly or acting through its subsidiaries, to purchase and make loans upon the security of automobiles and other articles, but they have stricken out the word "directed" from the bill.

With the exception of authorizing the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to buy these automobiles, what difference is there between this set-up and the present set-up of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation? At the present time the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, as I understand it, is authorized to make loans to automobile

dealers for this purpose. Of course, they contemplate that they can take title to the car if they do not pay their loan. So in practice what difference is there between the present situation and the contemplated situation?

Mr. BISHOP. There is this difference only, it seems to me: Mr. Jones stated without qualification before the Senate committee yesterday that if Congress through an authorization expressed a public policy as to what his agency, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, should do, that they would carry through; and that if as the bill was reported out by the Senate, if that is adopted expressing as the policy established by Congress, and automobile dealers and others within the purview of this bill should have this relief—

Mr. WOLCOTT. You think that it would be stronger with that word left in?

Mr. BISHOP. Of course, it would be much stronger if the word "directed" were there. But on the unequivocal statements of the Secretary yesterday on the adoption by Congress of a policy as to how this work out should be made, it seems to us that it would be done.

Mr. WOLCOTT. He is authorized to purchase or make these loans. And then in subsection (5) on page 3 the Senate has removed the mandatory features in line 11 and changed the word "shall" to "may," so that he does not have to purchase or loan on the request of any dealer. What was the purpose of making that change?

Mr. BISHOP. That was taken out for the same purpose—that Mr. Jones stated that it was not necessary for his agency to be directed; that if his agency were authorized by Congress to carry out a policy, it would be done.

Furthermore, it was expressed yesterday that while it is known today what the coverage of this bill is, circumstances may arise in connection with the necessity of rationing that other articles might come under here which would embarrass the agency.

For example, one Senator pointed out the situation where the Reconstruction Finance Corporation might be called upon by a dealer to purchase one bicycle, and the relief in that situation would be so limited that it would not be necessary, as it is in the broader situation, and that the expense of handling such a situation might be prohibitive to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Those are the two considerations.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Is the National Automobile Dealers' Association satisfied to have the language in line 10, on page 1, changed to a mere authorization instead of directing, and with the idea of trusting the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to do that, and to have the word "shall" changed to "may" in line 11, page 3, subsection (5)?

Mr. BISHOP. Yesterday I made the statement before the Senate committee, representing my group, that we were opposed to the elimination of the word "directed" and the change of the word "shall" to "may," but that in view of the unequivocal statements of the Secretary on the record of that hearing it was inconceivable that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation would refuse to follow out the authorization of Congress.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Congress has authorized the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans to small industries and small businesses. Congress has authorized the Federal Reserve bank to make loans aggregating \$139,000,000 to small business. Because those loans were not being made, we found it necessary to introduce a new bill reenunciating the legislative policy in the hope that because of that they would go ahead and make these loans, because, of course, we are as deeply concerned over small business as we are concerned with the automotive industry.

The automobile dealers are in the most peculiar situation. It seems to me—and

doesn't it to you?—that Mr. Jones has authority at the present time under existing law to make these loans if he considers it advisable to do so?

Mr. BISHOP. Yes; I believe that that is true.

The only thing which impels me to go along with this bill is because it is satisfactory to the people who are most vitally concerned. In section 5 (h) you will notice that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized to purchase or make loans upon the security of any article or commodity. Then, in subsection 4, on page 2, it says:

Such purchases and loans shall be made on a basis which will enable any such dealer to secure for any such article or commodity that has been in the stock of one or more dealers for an aggregate of 18 months or longer after the beginning of the rationing an amount not less than the fair retail price as fixed by the Price Administrator for such article or commodity wherever located.

The Senate version of this bill is as follows, and frankly I cannot find in the bill any language which substantiates the Senate version as expressed in the debates on yesterday. The Senate was told, and we will have to accept it, that loans may be made 2, 4, 6 months or up to 18 months after the rationing order takes effect. The rationing order took effect January 1, 1942. So the automobile dealers believe that at the present moment the Reconstruction Finance Corporation may make such loans and purchases. Now, that is undoubtedly true, but the Senate has interpreted subsection 4 on page 2 to mean that after the 18-month period has expired, then the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is directed to make those loans and purchases. I cannot find in the following language "such purchases and loans shall be made on a basis which," and so forth, any directive language except as it is qualified by the word "such", the first word in the sentence, which refers to the loans which they are only authorized but not directed to make. If they do make those loans the language in subsection 4 directs that they shall be made according to a certain formula, but there is nothing in the bill; and I want the American Automobile Dealers Association to understand that at the present time, notwithstanding any debates in the Senate and notwithstanding any statements which have been made before the committee, there is nothing in this bill which directs the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans or to purchase automobiles or any other product.

Now, it seems to me that the American Automobile Dealers' Association should not be disillusioned, but that the success of this relief measure is wholly dependent upon the charity of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in interpreting this act broadly enough to give them the relief which they think they are getting under this bill. It is only because they are satisfied with this bill that I am willing to go along with it in its present form.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. It seems to me that it is the legislative intent of this body to relieve small businessmen who have been caught by virtue of the rationing orders, and we are not concerned whether or not the Government makes a profit out of that deal or loses money. What we are trying to do is to rescue these small-business people.

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is my attitude.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Therefore, it seems to me it should be our legislative intent to give directive force to this legislation and not permissive force.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I can understand how difficult it might be to direct them to do something without giving them some discretion. By simply putting the word "direct" in there will not accomplish the purpose of the act, because you are likely to open up the door to thousands and hundreds of thousands of lawsuits, because the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, unlike the Federal Government, can be sued without its consent. But I believe language can be drawn to make mandatory the announced policy of the Congress in respect to this act without subjecting the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to a multiplicity of suits.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA. Can the gentleman tell me on what basis these loans are to be made? Take an automobile dealer who has on hand 40 cars upon which he has paid in one-fourth of the purchase price.

Mr. WOLCOTT (reading):

Such purchases and loans shall be made on a basis which will enable any such dealer to secure for any such article or commodity which he has on hand an amount not less than its cost to him (to the extent that such cost is a reasonable cost incurred in the ordinary course of trade or business), plus a reasonable allowance for transportation costs, storage, handling, servicing, insurance, carrying charges, and other expenses incurred by the dealer in connection with such article or commodity.

Further confusion arises from the fact that after the automobile has been held for 18 months, all he gets is a fair retail price as determined by the Price Administrator; and that is one of the incongruities of the bill to which I refer.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. Can the gentleman show me any place in the bill where the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized or directed either to purchase or make loans prior to 18 months after the article has been acquired by the dealer?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes. I may say that I interpret this bill broadly to mean that they can make purchases and loans at any time beginning with the enactment of this law, but that if the car or other article has been in the stock of one or more dealers for more than 18 months, a different formula is set up than that for the loans and purchases made previous to the expiration of 18 months. That is modified somewhat by the section on page 4, which states that they cannot

sell it under 19 months excepting to dealers.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

I hope that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation will interpret this bill in such manner as to give all of these dealers the relief which they think they are going to get, because I think we should make it very clear that it is the legislative policy to help the automotive dealers either to liquidate their stocks or to be put in a position where they can carry them at a reasonable profit so that their contribution to the war effort will not be wholly out of proportion to that expected of the general public.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. I have listened with interest to the gentleman's discussion of this bill, but to clarify this situation so this Record will indicate what this Congress has in mind in enacting this legislation, do I understand that the gentleman's contention is that as specifically referred to automobile dealers and stocks, automobiles that have been frozen, that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation under the terms of this bill may make a loan immediately upon the passage of this bill, provided as set forth in section 1 the conclusion is to be drawn that that dealer cannot dispose of his stock within a period of 6 months in the normal and ordinary conduct of his business?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I believe that is the correct interpretation.

Mr. KEEFE. And if the Reconstruction Finance Corporation so determines as to an individual dealer they may make a loan, or they may not make a loan; and if they decide to make a loan, the loan may be in the amount set forth in subparagraph 3 on page 2 of the bill which gives reasonable cost plus reasonable allowance for the items set forth in the paragraph?

Mr. WOLCOTT. In that case the cost would not be reflected in the retail price, but it would be in the wholesale price to the retailer plus the transportation cost and other items.

Mr. KEEFE. Is it the gentleman's interpretation and the interpretation of the committee that if the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has failed, neglected, or refused to make a loan to a dealer, that at the expiration of 18 months from the date of the freezing order, January 1, 1942, the language of this bill, or some agreement, or some interpretation made of it in the Senate will lead us to the conclusion that such dealer may demand a loan from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation? And that if such loan is made it shall be on the basis of a fair retail price as then fixed by the Price Administrator?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I believe the gentleman has placed the same interpretation on the bill that I have placed upon it, although it differs somewhat from the Senate's interpretation. I think what they intended to do in this bill originally was to fix a retail price after 18 months

plus these charges contained on page 2, because the original bill as introduced stated that they would pay a retail price after the 18 months plus a reasonable allowance for transportation costs, and so forth. Your committee originally accepted the formula where if the dealer held the automobile for longer than a year he would be paid his retail price plus these allowances; but they struck out these allowances. They have extended the period from 1 year to 18 months and substituted a price as fixed by the Price Control Administrator for such article or commodity wherever located.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further to permit me to make a brief statement?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield briefly.

Mr. KEEFE. Namely, that I am in complete accord with what the gentleman has said: That there must be some very violent assumptions indulged to find language in the bill as written that will purport to carry out the attempt that has been expressed as being in this bill. I personally cannot see it there at all.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. TREADWAY. As I understand the purpose of the act it is entirely to relieve the distressed automobile dealers.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Automotive dealers and all other dealers who handle rationed goods.

Mr. TREADWAY. It has to do with automobile traffic. Does the gentleman from Michigan consider that under all the circumstances this is the best relief they can expect in the way of legislation?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No; I do not.

Mr. TREADWAY. Then why can we not amend the bill to give much better conditions?

I cannot too strongly urge upon this House the necessity of enacting legislation which will relieve the automobile dealer from the situation in which he finds himself by reason of Government restrictions. I attended the first and several subsequent sessions of the Small Business Committee and have given a great deal of time and attention to the matter of aiding the automobile dealers in my district. It is common knowledge among us that the small business man has received scant consideration from the Government until within the past few weeks and I hope that Congress will make up for lost time in this direction.

The plight of the automobile dealer is well set forth in the following letter which I received from one of them in my district:

The Government quota of new cars authorized for sale for the period ending May 31 for Franklin County, Mass., is 64, or approximately 21 cars each for the months of March, April, and May.

Two doctors have applied for new cars and have been refused by the local board. These two owners' cars are 1940 models and have seen 2 years of hard usage. The refusal was based on the fact that these cars were not older than 1937 models and have not been driven 100,000 miles. I know of no doctor who keeps a car more than 2 years and the largest percentage of new-car buyers are

owners of 2-year-old cars. No new cars have been released on the March quota.

There are few new-car buyers available and it is going to be a difficult task to dispose of the number of new cars that are authorized for sale on Government quotas. Stocks of new cars purchased prior to January 16, 1942, should be unfrozen and allowed unrestricted retail sale.

Dealers are desperately in need of their working capital which is frozen in new cars, and being compelled to hold these cars for an indefinite period increases the cost to the consumer (which I doubt very much they will pay), is no benefit to the Government, and a severe hardship to the dealer. The gross profit on the few cars that we would be able to sell would tend to reduce the red figures for our year's operation.

We are not expecting business as usual. We are not finding fault with the rationing of tires as we know the situation is critical, but it is only natural to hope to survive in order that we may be able to resume business after this emergency, and we have been in the automobile business for 34 years.

We accepted new cars that were shipped January 16 with the knowledge that they were to be held until 1943 as a future stock pile. We, however, feel that we are not unpatriotic in expecting that Government quotas of new cars should be disposed of without restrictions by local rationing boards.

We would be only too eager to invest all the gross profits on any new cars sold this year in Government bonds if we could eliminate the expense of carrying this inventory and have available our working capital, now frozen by Government action, to carry on for the duration. The situation is critical and we will thoroughly appreciate your assistance.

I fully concur in the statements contained in the above letter and hope that very definite relief may be provided by proper legislation at an early date.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The American Automobile Dealers' Association seems to be satisfied with this bill.

Mr. TREADWAY. If it suits them we are expected to accept it as the representatives of the American people?

Mr. WOLCOTT. After all, this legislation is introduced here primarily to help the 44,000 automotive dealers who find themselves in this peculiar situation. I believe if this bill is satisfactory to them and if they have confidence in the administrators of this bill to the extent where they feel justified in making the statements they have in respect to it, that we are justified in accepting it.

Mr. TREADWAY. They particularly represent those who are interested in this bill?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes; and in my extension of remarks I will insert excerpts from the testimony in that regard.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes, and now yield to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. KOPPLEMANN].

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. What I want to clarify is this: It was the request of the automobile dealers that they get these loans. The original bill as introduced carried with it a direction to the R. F. C. to make them, is that correct?

Mr. WOLCOTT. That is right.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. I am interested in the statement made that the automobile dealers are satisfied. I can recollect very clearly before the committee the

statement of the automobile dealers that up to the present time the terms laid down by the R. F. C. in giving them loans were so unsatisfactory that they could not proceed.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I do not want to argue that with the gentleman. The point is they have the authority to do it now, and they have not been doing it in the past. I may say to the committee that there are between 600,000 and 700,000 new automobiles in the hands of these 44,000 automobile dealers. Since the freeze order went into effect on January 1 there have been only 15,000 sales. Unless something is done to relieve the automotive dealers, in addition to this bill, unless the restrictions are raised to allow them to distribute these automobiles a little faster, it will take from 6 to 8 years to unload the stock which they have. You can figure it out for yourselves. Of course, these stocks never will be unloaded because as soon as this war is over people are going to wait until the new models come out and we are going to find a backlog of what will then be old automobiles, which will then be in an unsalable condition. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation, under the terms of the bill, cannot take them if they are in an unsalable condition.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. So it largely depends upon the Administrator of the R. F. C. whether or not these automobile dealers get relief?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Yes. I think the whole thing depends on the way the act will be administered.

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Is the committee advised of any plan of administration by the R. F. C. in the event this bill passes?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No, not in detail.

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Is it the gentleman's idea that the bill will be administered through the administration in Washington or through its agencies all over the country?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I assume it will take advantage of all the machinery which is available, including, of course, its office all over the United States.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I hope this legislation will help to solve the problem facing many small businessmen today, automobile dealers, especially, because of necessary rationing.

I am not very hopeful, however, that this will be accomplished as this bill is not specific enough in its provisions. When doubt rises here today as to what certain paragraphs mean, we can well foresee the future in its administration.

The clean-cut solution to this problem is for our Government to purchase all stocks of automobiles, refrigerators, electric appliances, in fact, any and all articles whose sale is forbidden without permit. This would give our businessmen

cash with which to go into other lines of business or into small war subcontracts.

We should not expect our automobile dealers to keep automobiles for 18 months and then only be able to loan upon them. These cars will become obsolete, the tires and parts will deteriorate. Taxes mount up, interest mounts up, and capital is tied up. All of these put together means bankruptcy in the end.

Surely our Government can take all frozen stocks off of dealers' hands, pay them cash for these stocks, automobiles or what not, and then arrange for the proper storage and sale eventually. The United States can carry such a load; the auto dealer, radio man, refrigerator salesman cannot carry it. They are willing to do their part, but they should not be asked to do the impossible. The load must be spread over the entire Nation.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I shall support the bill now before us. While this bill is broad enough to cover a number of articles or commodities that are rationed, it is primarily for the relief of the automobile dealers of our country.

I am not entirely convinced that this bill which we are today passing is the best and most complete answer to the problem of the automobile dealers of our country. On the other hand, I am aware that this problem is most difficult and far reaching; that it involves automobile dealers in all the States, in many different sizes of towns and cities, and automobile dealers in many different types of local economy. I also realize that it is futile to wait for a chance to vote for the perfect bill; therefore I shall support this measure.

Wartime is a difficult time for many people. Our citizens are called upon to bear heavy and harsh burdens, but it occurs to me that perhaps the automobile dealers have been dealt with more harshly than the general average of our population. If there is any group that is entitled to some legislation by this Congress, to relieve their situation, it is the automobile dealers. The automobile dealers—and by that I mean the wholesalers, the jobbers, the distributors, the salesmen, garage owners, and all of those engaged in distributing automobiles—are responsible for building this great automobile industry in our country. If they had not provided the outlet for our factories that produce automobiles, the industry could have never grown as it did.

The automobile men that I know might be termed "small business men." They do not represent big business, nor do their employees represent big labor. They have, however, played an important role in every town in our country.

They are a class of businessmen which the defense program has not helped. The great factories have been converted to war plants, and thus they go on. That way big business is taken care of. The laboring men in our automobile factories with their powerful organizations have seen to it that they got a share of our war-production work. Thus big labor has been taken care of.

The picture has been quite different for the automobile people in the towns throughout the United States. Garage owners, the jobbers, the wholesalers, and dealers have not been awarded any war-production work to speak of. The employees of these jobbers, wholesalers, and dealers have not been able to find work, in many instances, in war production. So again I say, if there is a group in the United States which are entitled to consideration by this Congress it is the automobile dealers. I am happy to support this bill before us today, and only wish that we could do more for this group.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LEONARD W. HALL].

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us is a step in the right direction, but it is only a step, as I view it, in the effort to extend justice and aid to the small businessman. It does bring him hope, and under the provisions of the measure before us it is the first concrete evidence he has had that the Government is going to come to his aid. In my view it is certainly not a full answer to the problems of the automobile dealer and the tire dealer, and other small businessmen who are being affected so desperately by the freezing and rationing orders that have been decreed by the administration. I should have liked to have seen this move come earlier, also.

Early in January of this year the Small Business Committee of the House, of which I am a member, invited the National Automobile Dealers Association to present their case to our committee. A public hearing was held and hundreds of dealers attended. I think it fair and in order to mention that in my estimation no more patriotic group of men ever assembled in our Capital City. They were disposed, also, as was evident from the beginning of the hearings, not to ask anything selfish, but simply that the committee understand their real plight; and that the Congress address itself to their problems. They asked no special favors; they knew that in their case, perhaps, it was inexorable that their particular business should feel a severe pinch, and they accepted the fact. Their whole attitude was to volunteer their best efforts for a united war effort, and the only thing that they asked was that the Government consider their problem as sympathetically as possible.

It is natural that these dealers were greatly disquieted by the fact that they have had many thousands of dollars tied up in new cars, which they could not sell or dispose of except under arbitrary Government regulations, while at the same time showroom rentals, finance charges, taxes, and a host of overhead expenses went on. They wanted, and were entitled to, an answer to the grave question which confronted each and every one of them; just when and how they could liquidate the automobiles that were frozen by Government order without the exaction of unreasonable sacrifices. Naturally, they could not expect that they should be left continuingly in a position of dire uncertainty.

Government officials were also witnesses at this hearing and from the

testimony given by them I believe the dealers had a right to assume that relief would not be in a distant day but would be forthcoming practically immediately. That was the clear implication of the testimony by some of these witnesses. I am of the opinion that many dealers went home with the definite idea that their situation would receive immediate attention and relief.

The fact of the matter is that nothing has really been done up to the time of this proposal. There has been a broadening of the rationing orders but without any real relief being afforded. Dealers have on hand automobiles that cannot be disposed of for years, under present conditions. Without the relief contemplated under this bill, bankruptcy and ruin would stare them in the face.

I am going to support the present bill as it stands, even though, in my estimation, it does not go far enough. I would prefer the adoption of a policy whereby the Government would purchase from the dealer those cars that he has on hand, if the dealer so desires, with a reasonable profit to the dealer. Under the proposal before us, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is expected, in a measure, to go some distance toward relieving the plight of these dealers, and inasmuch as the National Automobile Dealers Association is sanguine to believe that this measure will help out much, and they are praying for its early passage, I am willing to do anything that I can to hasten it along.

Everything I have said about the car dealers applies to the tire dealers, who also, in a very large group, appeared before our committee. Their situations, fundamentally, are identical.

Other small business men will have their articles and commodities frozen and rationed as time goes on. Their plight will be the same. This bill will give all of them some measure of relief.

I trust that the pending proposal may be considered as a forerunner of other measures that will be solicitous of the situation that small business finds itself in today. Certainly, it is not only our duty, but vitally necessary that we encourage it by every reasonable assistance, so that small business may be sustained and also encouraged in its desire to play an increasing part in the war production effort.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

H. R. 6995 FOR THE RELIEF OF DEALERS IN ARTICLES AND COMMODITIES RATIONED UNDER AUTHORITY OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this bill, H. R. 6995, which has for its purpose the relief of dealers in certain articles or commodities rationed under the authority of the United States. Early in the year I attended the hearings of the unofficial committee, which had under examination this whole subject of relief for our citizens who have suffered great injury by reason of the freezing orders in connection with the rationing of commodities needed for war purposes. Those that were particularly hit were the automobile dealers and the dealers in tires and other automotive equipment. Many of these dealers in my own district

have urged me to support legislation of this type for their relief, and I have from the outset been desirous of securing the enactment of such measures as will prevent, as far as possible, the closing of these small-business concerns.

On April 22 last I received from James H. Cassell, of the Oregon Automobile Dealers Association, a telegram reading as follows:

Car dealers of State will appreciate it tremendously if you will support Patman financial relief bill, H. R. 6761, at House Banking and Currency hearings beginning 22d. Bill calculated to permit dealers to liquidate stocks of new cars without too great sacrifice. Dealer situation more precarious than ever and they'll all go broke if relief does not come soon. Thanks.

I appeared before the Committee of the House on Banking and Currency and urged the early approval of this bill, and I am glad to know that not only is the House considering it but that the Senate has likewise considered and approved a bill which, according to my information, is in all respects similar to the one now before us and that the amendments adopted by the Senate have been or will be incorporated in this House bill.

It is my information that there are 70,000,000 people in the United States who are directly or indirectly affected by the automobile industry, and it certainly behooves us to enact legislation that will prevent the freezing of this entire industry. We know that the orders heretofore promulgated have been of such a nature that they have practically put out of business all of these dealers. They have large stocks of cars and equipment on hand which they are forbidden to sell under the rationing program. These cars are costing substantial sums for storage, insurance, depreciation, and overhead for maintaining the place of business in which the merchandise is kept for sale.

Mr. Chairman, we will not know until this bill becomes operative and we have had an opportunity to determine from actual experience whether or not it will meet the demands of the situation. The National Automobile Association has given its approval of the measure and is urging its enactment, and it has been stated on the floor here today by the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee that the Government departments having in charge the rationing program have given their approval to the bill. I therefore urge the passage of the bill and trust that it will receive the support of this House so that it may become a law without further delay.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I propose to support this bill because it seems to be the best that can be obtained at the present time. I am far from satisfied with its contents, and there are some provisions in it which are difficult to understand. There is no definite provision which will compel the R. F. C. to make these loans, and I am also somewhat disturbed about the 18-month feature.

It is essential, however, that legislation be enacted as quickly as possible which will offer some measure of relief to the thousands of automobile dealers who face liquidation of their businesses. You will recall that the original Government order prohibiting sales of new automobiles came on January 1 this year without warning. The first order tied up all new automobiles in dealers' hands for 15 days. This order was later extended to include all of the month of January and then later extended to include the month of February, and then extended to include March and April.

So all this time these automobile dealers have been forced to sit by and see their business disintegrate and to see their losses mount up without any cash funds being provided to enable them to meet their obligations.

This delay and confusion is inexcusable. No action has been taken despite the fact that solemn assurances of Government officials had been given to the effect that the Government would not ask the dealers to incur losses resulting from this freeze order.

Hundreds of automobile dealers throughout the country have already been forced out of business because of the regulations. To those who are still struggling to maintain their establishments, the freeze order of the past 4 months, plus the failure of the rationing program to function effectively and return even partially their operating expenses, has seriously depleted the capital structure of these dealer organizations. In many instances, these enforced losses amount to actual confiscation of business.

The automobile dealers of America fully realize that we are at war, and they are prepared to make any reasonable sacrifice in this emergency. They are, however, entitled to fair and equitable treatment, because they represent a very integral part in our domestic economy and in the maintenance of an important phase of our transportation system, and not be victimized and put out of business by Government edict when such action is unnecessary and when such a sacrifice is needless.

I assume that this legislation has the approval of the National Automobile Dealers Association, and I am going to support it because I feel it is not only a duty but an obligation upon this Congress to protect and preserve an important part of our business structure. These dealers are clearly entitled to help from the Government in this situation which has been thrust upon them without warning and because of conditions beyond their control.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time, 4½ minutes, to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, in recognition of the fine work the gentleman from Indiana has done on this bill, I yield him 4 additional minutes.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, when the original freezing order on new automobiles was issued on January 1 of this year, about everybody was shocked by it.

And that includes not only the dealers but many persons who desired to buy new cars.

For the dealers particularly was the order a matter of great concern. Many of them had large stocks of new cars on hand. Small dealers, of course, had a lesser number of cars than large dealers, but for all those cars represented a substantial part of their assets. In addition, their overhead expenses were large and represented a continuing charge. Except for certain savings in personnel, many of those charges remain fixed today. And, as everyone knows, many of the dealers had large and expensive showrooms which, without cars to move to the public, today represent a dead loss.

There was so much interest in the problem of the dealers that our Select Committee on Small Business, of which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is the chairman, and of which I am a member, called a meeting to hear them and get their suggestions as to what might properly be done. That meeting was held in January and was attended by upward of 500 dealers from all over the country. Many of them made statements before our committee. It must be said to their credit that they all exhibited the highest patriotism and complete willingness to make any sacrifice necessary to the most effective prosecution of the war. While some of them may have had some doubts as to the necessity for all parts of the orders entered, they did not question them. On the contrary, they were emphatic in their complete willingness to go along with any necessary requirement.

However, they did urgently ask that the Government take such proper steps as might in some measure alleviate their difficulties and particularly afford them some relief from some of their most pressing financial problems.

In order to get the complete picture, our committee also called representatives of the different governmental departments to testify. From the testimony, I understood that some action would be taken looking to the financial relief of the dealers. I understood that some plan would be worked out under which the Government would take the cars off a dealer's hands in the event he wanted such done.

But it is also my understanding that such action has not been taken; at least no satisfactory action has been taken. Hence, this bill which we are now considering. And it should be clear that if this bill is passed and becomes law, it is the intention of the Congress that the Government shall afford such relief to the dealers by making the loans as provided for or buying the cars as provided for after the expiration of the time fixed in the bill. I also understood such assurance has been given to the Banking and Currency Committee.

It is true that in the original bill proposed the automobile dealers association did want a directed, mandatory provision, or so recommended. But it likewise is my understanding that in con-

sideration of the definite assurances that were given by the R. F. C., that the congressional intent as expressed here would be carried out, it was deemed advisable not to insist upon a direct, positive requirement, and with that I am not in disagreement.

Just a word as to theory which I think underlies and supports this bill. Here is what has happened. The Government steps in and freezes and rations new cars in the hands of the dealers who own them. The Government tells the dealers to whom they can sell cars. The classes to whom cars can be sold include only those engaged either directly or indirectly in war or Government work. In plain words, the Government has taken these cars from the dealers for a public use.

In my considered opinion, such freezing and rationing approximates the exercise of the right of eminent domain. It is in reality a taking. Now, such a taking clearly requires that just compensation be paid to the person from whom the property is taken. That is just what this bill undertakes to do, and I think that is all it undertakes to do. Certainly it would not be fair for the Government to freeze these cars, thereby in effect taking them from the dealer, and at the same time require him to remain in charge of them, storing them and keeping them at his own risk and expense. Assuming the necessity for the Government taking these cars for public use, and there is no denial of that necessity, then certainly the least the Government can do for the dealer affected is to enable the dealer to carry the cars, or take them off his hands at his option, thereby enabling him to shrink up his establishment if possible and stay in business if possible to afford the service which is so necessary to the maintenance of the cars now on the road.

While this measure, if enacted into law, will provide substantial relief to many automobile dealers, it is far from being the complete answer to their many problems. I suspect that most of them would much rather sell the automobiles they have on hand direct to persons in their communities who have need of them and who can qualify under such rationing orders as the Office of Price Administration may see fit to impose or continue rather than sell them to the Government.

In that connection it might be well to recall that when the automobile dealers were first before our Select Committee on Small Business it was represented that the cars then on hand would be rationed in such manner that they would all be sold under such rationing orders within 12 months. That such a goal would not be achieved under the rationing orders originally promulgated and until recently maintained is now clear to everyone.

That there has been a lot of resentment, both in the Congress and in the country, about the way that the freezing and rationing of new automobiles has been handled cannot be denied. To be perfectly frank about it, there has been a feeling that the drastic orders which have hamstrung and, in many cases, bankrupted dealers were imposed with little

factual information as to possible results. In any event, initial tests of the rationing order have shown it defective in a number of ways.

It is undoubtedly true that when a freezing order is to be entered about the only thing to do is enter it and then look around to see what may finally be done. But those in charge of the order should not be too deliberate and slow about taking that look. I just hope that the easing of the rationing order on new automobiles which is now being effected will accomplish the desired results. Such results would not be at all unpopular in Congress. They certainly would not be unpopular with the dealers and, finally, they would not be unpopular with the public itself.

Now, one thing more. There has been some discussion—and there may be more—about what the term "fair retail price," as it appears in section 4, means with relation to new automobiles. As bearing on that, consider the following: The Office of Price Administration has issued price schedule 85, fixing a maximum retail price for new automobiles. It provides that the maximum retail price that may be charged for a new automobile shall be made up of four factors: First, factory list price; second, transportation charge; third, a handling and delivery charge of 5 percent of the factory list and transportation, or \$75, whichever is lower; and, fourth, 1 percent of the list, or \$15, whichever is lower, for each month after February 1, 1942.

This is the formula which O. P. A. has established for sales at retail to the public of new automobiles. This must represent the fair retail price in the opinion of the Price Administrator, as he obviously would not set a price which he believed to be in excess of a fair price for sales at retail. There have been and will be no more new automobiles produced since this order was made and before the 18 months expires since the freezing order was made on January 1, provided that the war has not ended. Therefore it is improbable that the Price Administrator would lower this price, as these automobiles will become more valuable as the supply gets smaller.

Therefore, under section 4 it will not be necessary for the Price Administrator to fix another retail price for new automobiles, and if any cars are tendered to R. F. C. under section 4, it would naturally follow that R. F. C. would pay the prices set out in price schedule 85. This price schedule is clearly in the minds of the Members of Congress in the consideration of this bill. The report of the debate in the other body yesterday shows that price schedule 85 was introduced showing the interpretation there of what the term "fair retail price" in this bill means as it is applied to automobiles.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PLOESER. I think it is well repeatedly to point out that this is not limited to automobiles. While the automobile situation motivated this bill and this legislation, nevertheless it applies equally well to the tire dealers who are in

just as serious straits as the automobile dealers, and it will likewise in the future apply to any dealer in any other commodity affected by rationing orders.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] such time as he may desire.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, during the past 4 months the automobile dealers of my congressional district, in unison with their brethren numbering some 44,000 throughout the United States have suffered untold hardship through the freezing order that has curtailed car sales and left them with capital tied up in stocks of new automobiles from which they are unable to retrieve their investments.

While patriotic appeals are heard for national unity and the entire Nation girds itself for every conceivable sacrifice, the automobile dealers of the Nation emerge as the forgotten men in the industrial and business life of their respective communities. They have suffered their huge losses with a patient attitude while witnessing their business organizations torn asunder by the lack of employment for their trained personnel. Many skilled mechanics, storeroom and sales employees trained in their particular vocations have been forced after years of honorable and faithful service to turn their talents in other directions and seek employment in any manner possible to retain their self-respect and provide a living for themselves and dependents.

It is an indisputable fact that the automobile dealers and their families have demonstrated their patriotic impulses beyond a shadow of a doubt, yet we must be practical in recognizing that such a patient attitude endured beyond reason cannot help but bring chaos and total destruction to an important field of business in the commerce lanes of the Nation. The stark specter of bankruptcy is stalking the footsteps of these thousands of automobile dealers and is certain to sound the death knell to this enterprising and resourceful group of American businessmen.

It is my earnest and sincere contention that if Congress hesitates to afford just and equitable relief to the distressing conditions so prevalent in the automobile business and affecting these dealers who represent every community in the Nation that we will be guilty of the unpardonable sin of turning a deaf ear to the harrowing plight of a great segment of American business life.

NATIONAL AUTOMOBILE DEALERS ASSOCIATION
FAVORS THE BILL AS WRITTEN

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, the National Automobile Dealers Association is 100 percent behind this bill. I am authorized and, in fact, the officials of that association have asked me to say they are in favor of the bill as it is written now.

The question of being authorized or directed is not disturbing them because they believe the R. F. C. will carry out the intentions of Congress as expressed in this bill.

There are 70,000,000 people in this country dependent upon automobile transportation every day—70,000,000 out

of 132,000,000. Therefore, it is necessary that we keep these cars going just as long as possible, and in order to keep these cars going it is necessary to keep these dealers going and these repair shops going, and this bill is offered for the purpose of keeping these dealers in business just as long as we can and encouraging these repair shops to stay open as long as possible.

Mr. HAINES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. HAINES. Am I correct in my interpretation that this measure only applies to new articles and does not apply, for instance, to second-hand cars?

Mr. PATMAN. Generally it does not apply to second-hand cars. It applies to new cars.

It is the hope of the committee that no amendments will be adopted to this bill, since it is the desire of the Banking and Currency Committee to encourage its passage and speed it to the White House. If it passes as it is now, it will go directly to the White House and no further legislative action will be required.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk proceeded to read the Senate bill.

Mr. STEAGALL (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The Senate bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, is amended by inserting after section 5g thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 5h. (a) In order to prevent and relieve distress among dealers in articles or commodities which are rationed in connection with the war effort, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, acting directly or through any of its subsidiary corporations, is authorized to purchase or make loans upon the security of any article or commodity the sale or distribution of which is rationed under authority of the United States, subject to the following terms and conditions:

"(1) Such purchases and loans shall be made only in the case of articles or commodities which have been rationed in a manner and under circumstances which have resulted or are likely to result in a substantial number of dealers being unable, in the ordinary course of trade or business, to sell within a period of 6 months from the beginning of such rationing the stocks of such articles or commodities which they have in stock.

"(2) Such purchases and loans shall be made only in the case of, or for the purpose of aiding or assisting, dealers a substantial part of whose business consists of dealing in and servicing rationed articles or commodities of one or more kinds.

"(3) Such purchases and loans shall be made on a basis which will enable any such dealer to secure for any such article or commodity which he has on hand an amount not less than its cost to him (to the extent that such cost is a reasonable cost incurred in the ordinary course of trade or business), plus a reasonable allowance for transportation costs, storage, handling, servicing, insurance, carrying charges, and other expenses incurred by the dealer in connection with such article or commodity.

"(4) Such purchases and loans shall be made on a basis which will enable any such dealer to secure for any such article or commodity that has been in the stock of one or more dealers for an aggregate of 18 months or longer after the beginning of the rationing an amount not less than the fair retail price as fixed by the Price Administrator for such article or commodity wherever located.

"(5) Such purchases may be made from and such loans made to such dealers or credit agencies furnishing credit for such dealers, and may be made upon the request of any dealer having title to the rationed article or commodity or having the right to acquire title thereto upon the discharge of his credit obligations with respect thereto.

"(b) The Reconstruction Finance Corporation may prescribe such additional terms and conditions with respect to such purchases and loans as it deems to be necessary and consistent with the purposes of this section: *Provided*, That the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall not be required to purchase or make a loan upon the security of any article or commodity which is not in a salable condition, or which has suffered substantial damage or deterioration as the result of negligence or lack of proper care: *And provided further*, That if, upon the sale of any article or commodity acquired pursuant to the terms of any loan contract entered into hereunder, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or any subsidiary corporation thereof shall not recover, by reason of any limitation upon sales price imposed pursuant to the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, the full amount of any such loan, no resource on account of such deficiency shall be had against the borrower. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized to sell at public or private sale, with or without competitive bidding, any article or commodity acquired by it pursuant to this section: *Provided*, That, until the expiration of 19 months after the beginning of the rationing of such article or commodity, no such sale shall be made except to a dealer in such article or commodity. In the event any such sale is made to another department or agency of the Government, such other department or agency is hereby authorized, notwithstanding any other provision of law, to pay for such article or commodity any price not in excess of a fair retail market price as of the date of such sale.

"(c) The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized to make such agreements or arrangements as may be necessary and appropriate for carrying out the purposes of this section, including agreements to pay to those from whom it acquires articles or commodities a portion of the proceeds realized by such Corporation from the sale of such articles or commodities. For the purposes of this section, an article or commodity shall be deemed to be rationed whenever its sale to the general public in the ordinary course of trade or business has been restricted or prohibited by any regulation or order made for the purpose of aiding in the more effective prosecution of the war effort or for the purpose of conserving the supply of such article or commodity.

"(d) No authority, limitation, restriction, or other provision contained in this section shall be construed to limit, restrict, modify, or otherwise in any way affect any authority or powers now or hereafter vested in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or in any corporation created or organized by or at the instance of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation."

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. KEAN rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey, a member of the committee.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEAN: Page 3, line 5, after the word "than", strike out "the fair retail price as fixed by the Price Administrator for such article or commodity wherever located" and insert "its cost to him (to the extent that such cost is a reasonable cost incurred in the ordinary course of trade or business) plus a reasonable allowance for storage, insurance, and financing."

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order: The gentleman is attempting to amend the House bill, when we are considering the Senate bill, and I suggest that he make his amendment conform to the Senate bill.

Mr. KEAN. We have never had any copy of the Senate bill.

Mr. PATMAN. There is one right here.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be so amended.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, it should be after the "than" on page 3, line 4.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that the amendment is now offered in correct form.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, the whole paragraph, if my amendment should be adopted, would read as follows:

Such purchases and loans shall be made on a basis which will enable any such dealer to secure for any such article or commodity that has been in the stock of one or more dealers for an aggregate of 18 months or longer after the beginning of the rationing, an amount not less than its cost to him, to the extent that such cost is a reasonable cost incurred in the ordinary course of trade or business, plus a reasonable allowance for storage, insurance, and financing.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to no one in my sympathy for the automobile dealer, in the problems with which he is faced. It is my belief that when the Government not only stops the production of an article, but also prevents the sale of the article which a dealer holds in stock, he is certainly entitled to some form of relief, but we must not let our sympathies warp our good judgment. The wording of this bill as introduced troubles me. As the war continues, not only will automobiles be rationed, but thousands and thousands of other articles must and will inevitably also be included in the rationing program. This bill as written on page 3 provides that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation at the end of 18 months shall buy any rationed article from the owner at the fair retail price fixed by the Price Administrator. It is true that this legislation only authorizes, and does not direct, but it lays down a pattern which Congress expresses as its will and it seems to me that it establishes a dangerous precedent for the future.

Today all are being asked to make sacrifices to win this war. Should we guarantee to anyone a profit on the sale of any article? Should the Government pay a dealer a profit on an article which it purchases to help him out? Is not the most which he should expect be that the Government will bail him out

and see that he has no loss on articles which it has prevented him from selling?

Now, looking at it from the dealer's point of view, what if the goods frozen should deteriorate or become obsolete through no fault of the owner who has been prevented from selling it by the Government? Is this owner not just as much entitled to "cost plus carrying charges" even though the O. P. A. names a fair retail price much lower than his cost? It seems to me that if we pass this legislation without my amendment, while justifiably trying to aid the automobile dealer, we may have enacted provisions which will haunt us in the future and which we will have cause to regret. My amendment will be fair to the owner, fair to the Government, and would not set a dangerous precedent.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask recognition in opposition to the amendment. I am opposed to this amendment. It is not known how far it will go. The bill says that the price will be the price fixed by the Price Administrator. That was deliberately written into the bill so as to encourage dealers to dispose of their stocks before the expiration of the 18 months, if possible. If you write some guaranteed cost provision into this bill you will give some dealers no inducement whatsoever to sell their cars, but will give them every inducement to hold them until after the 18 months and turn them over to the Government.

Now, the gentleman's amendment does give them a guaranteed price—a price that is the reasonable cost incurred in the ordinary course of trade and business. Does that include his overhead? What are the items to be included in that? I do not know. It is possible the price may be greatly in excess of the price fixed by the Price Administrator. It may be less. We do not know. It says:

In addition to the reasonable cost, plus a reasonable allowance for storage, insurance, and financing.

In other words, if a concern owns its own finance company, owns its own insurance company, owns its own storage, they have enormous storage space for thousands of cars to be stored, there is no inducement or incentive to sell those cars, but there is every incentive to keep those cars where they are, because they get paid for the storage, for the insurance, and for the financing by their own finance company. So the gentleman's amendment is very vague in two ways. One is as to how low the cost may be. The other is it may be so exceedingly high as to damage someone else, including the Government. So it is indefinite. Let us make it definite by having the Price Administrator fix the price, and we presume he will fix a reasonable price. Then the dealers, not knowing that price in advance, will have every inducement to try to make these trades before the end of 18 months, and sell the cars themselves.

So I suggest the gentleman's amendment is not a good one in conformity with the views he has presented. It is too vague and indefinite. Nobody knows.

It has a tendency to cause dealers to keep their cars and unload them on the Government at the end of the 18 months, rather than to try to make sales in the meantime.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. STEAGALL. Does the gentleman regard it as an unwise and thoughtless thing to nullify the power conferred upon the Price Administrator under the existing law as it will be applied to the various articles that may be rationed, and to which this bill would be applicable?

Mr. PATMAN. The chairman is exactly right. This is a fundamental change in existing law. Let us not change this bill. Let it remain as it is, and let it go to the White House today, because these dealers are going bankrupt, hundreds of them, every week by reason of the act of our Government, over which they had no control.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman. I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the best word I can figure out to describe this piece of legislation to relieve the automobile dealers is the word "fuzzy." It is fuzzy on the outside, it is fuzzy around the edges, and fuzzy in the middle. Any piece of legislation that even members of the committee cannot accurately interpret is "fuzzy." The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] said, if I understood him correctly, that this 18-month provision was in there for the purpose of encouraging dealers to sell their cars before the expiration of 18 months. I presume the gentleman will say now that the Office of Price Administration will now commence to ration cars, so change the rationing order, that the dealers can sell all their cars within the 18 months. At the present time there is not a Chinaman's chance of any dealer in the United States selling his cars, under the present rationing order, within 8 or 10 or 12 years. If there is any way you can tell me how those two things rationalize with each other, I would like to know.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. Does the gentleman take into consideration the effect of the recent order that has been issued relative to those being eligible to receive cars?

Mr. HINSHAW. Where is that order published? I have not seen it yet.

Mr. PATMAN. It was published in all the newspapers last Sunday.

Mr. HINSHAW. I did not see it and I read the papers carefully. I know the dealers in my district have so many cars they will not be able to sell them in years, under any rationing orders that now exist. If they are going to permit dealers freely to sell their cars within 18 months, then perhaps I can go along with the provision of subsection (4), but under present circumstances there is no possibility of it. It is up to the local rationing boards to decide to whom and when these cars will be sold. At the present time, the dealers are in a buyer's

market, any buyer who can get a certificate from a rationing board can go out among the various dealers in his own area and shop for a price and get it; frequently a price that represents a great loss to the dealer.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Do you know what the provisions of the order 'hat goes into effect tomorrow are?

Mr. HINSHAW. I have not seen them.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Roughly they have taken the existing order and have broadened it. They have simplified it. They have cut out a lot of the restrictions heretofore made.

Mr. HINSHAW. Have they permitted dealers to sell all of their cars that are worth over \$1,000, without restriction?

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Here is what they have said: They say in order to get a new car your old car must have been of 1939 vintage or earlier. It must have 40,000 miles on it. The previous order was 100,000. And they could be sold to anybody who is directly or indirectly connected with the war effort.

Mr. HINSHAW. Yes; there is another provision for those engaged in the war effort—and who is not? Every farmer is engaged in the war effort, every retail dealer in foodstuffs is engaged in the war effort, every man, woman, and child in the United States is engaged in the war effort. If you allow that language to be interpreted as it should be, then why have any rationing restrictions at all on automobiles? I just do not see this thing. I think it is wrong at the start and wrong at the finish. You could say to a dealer, for example, that he can sell any car worth over \$1,000, to anybody but there is hardly anybody in the United States except the War Department who will buy an automobile at those prices today. Every such car is frozen, every car worth over \$1,000 or \$1,200 is frozen in the hands of the dealer where it is today.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. The gentleman would not say the Automobile Dealer's Association was cockeyed, would he? They have O. K.'d this bill.

Mr. HINSHAW. I think they are wrong. I think they will be mighty sorry before they get through living with this bill.

I can point out a few examples in my own district, and that is the only place I know about. The rest of the Members have districts of their own. I can point out the fact that there are trucks in my district that are specially designed with special bodies for a special purpose. The rationing board down here in Washington that decides these things does not let them be delivered. Take the city of Glendale, Calif., that orders three garbage trucks with special bodies, has them ready for delivery last December. People are throwing garbage into the streets because they cannot get those trucks to haul away garbage. For goodness' sake, what is wrong? Why can they not get their garbage trucks which have been ready for delivery since December? Should some one or two men in Washington decide whether they should get them?

I say this whole rationing program so far as automobiles are concerned should be changed. Every man, woman, and child in this country is engaged in this war effort in one way or another.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. The Federal Register for Tuesday, April 28, 1942—

Mr. HINSHAW. That is today, is it not?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; page 3097 contains the Executive order relative to the rationing of automobiles. I merely call it to the attention of the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, 5 minutes is not enough time to talk on this vitally important subject. One of these days I intend to ask for a special order and talk for a half hour.

I can see every good reason for restricting the production of automobiles and turning the plants to the production of articles used in war. And I can see good reason for priorities in the purchase of present stocks of automobiles and trucks to those who need them most. But the Office of Price Administration has not stopped there. Let me draw the picture briefly.

With 700,000 cars in dealers' hands today, the O. P. A. has so scared the buyers that there are practically no buyers, even among those who could use cars. It has become such a bad situation that people having cars, used cars, are beginning to flood the used-car market, and that is fast becoming a thin buyers' market.

Why? Because the O. P. A. has shut down, first on tires and now on gasoline. Who wants to buy a car, either new or used, when tires cannot be had and gasoline is to be rationed? If this keeps up you can relax all the restrictions on new-car sales and still there will be almost no sales. It is absurd. The whole situation is an absurd creation.

American life has come to be built around the automobile. People have been encouraged to enjoy the suburban life, to get out and away from the big cities. Workers in the Lockheed aircraft plant in my district—52,000 of them—live an average of 10.6 miles from that plant, according to a recent survey. They live in the open spaces, many thousands of them. Their wives and children must travel miles to stores and schools, and public-utility transportation has not been designed or built to serve these people.

Then comes the rubber rationing to throw consternation among them and all of the 360,000 people in my district. At the same time, information comes to my Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce that there is enough used rubber available to completely bridge the gap from present crude stocks of natural rubber to the time when synthetic rubber is available in adequate quantities. But nobody seems to pay any attention to the reusing of used rubber stocks for tires. Why not?

Then comes the gasoline-rationing order. Transportation facilities are being built rapidly to take care of the needs of our people. Any gasoline shortage

due to the tanker situation is being rapidly taken care of. Then why frighten the people into thinking that the temporary gasoline shortage is permanent? Why? To fool the people into conserving rubber against a rubber shortage that need not exist if only used rubber is reused. The whole business is a self-created nightmare. It need not be. It could and can be avoided if only a few brains are used. But there seems to be an enormous vacuum in thinking. There are men in this Government who know the truth—honest, intelligent men. And there are others who blast forth with orders and newer orders that confuse the whole picture. Too many agencies are concerned with the same subject matter, and each wants to appear authoritative. Hence the muddled thinking. I respectfully suggest if one genuine automobile man and one genuine tire man were given full authority to work this problem out it would be found that the problem is not nearly as bad as some would have us think. In the meantime, new cars are rotting for lack of sales—an inexcusable waste.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that if the committee took time to study the amendment just offered by the gentleman from New Jersey they would be heartily in favor of it for several reasons, one being that there is a possibility that the automobile dealers will get more at the end of 18 months than they would under the language of the bill as it is now written, because, if I understand the gentleman's amendment correctly, it gives them a price at cost to them plus the storage, and insurance, and financing charges which might greatly exceed the retail price. The retail price as established by the Price Administrator might be much lower than the cost of the automobile to the dealer plus his storage charges, his insurance, and financing charges. There is, however, perhaps a more important reason why this amendment should be adopted, and it is as follows: The Office of Price Administration was never authorized under any act of the Congress to fix a retail price. We are launching upon an entirely new program here. The Price Control Act provides that under certain circumstances in accordance with certain formulas, the Price Administrator may set a ceiling on prices. There is nothing in the language of that act or of any act we have passed except this proposed language which allows anyone to fix a price. This not only authorizes the Price Administrator to fix a price on automobiles, but it authorizes him to fix a price on refrigerators, washing machines, ironers, and all this other equipment which is rationed today. It states to him:

"In addition to the powers which are granted to you to fix a ceiling on prices, you may now fix the price," an authority which he never has had and which he never should have. It was intended in the Price Control Act that prices would be allowed to fluctuate under a certain ceiling and that no one autocratically or

otherwise might have the authority in this Government to say, "You shall set the price on a commodity at a certain figure." It is all right to say to Mr. Henderson that he has authority to set the top price on an automobile at \$1,400, but it is not right and it is not in keeping with the spirit of the Price Control Act to say to Mr. Henderson, "You can set the price at \$1,400 and they shall pay no more or no less."

The language in the bill as it was introduced did not contemplate any action by the Price Administrator at all. It said that under these circumstances the dealers would get a fair retail price plus a reasonable allowance for transportation cost, storage, handling, servicing, insurance, carrying charges, and other expenses incurred by the dealer in handling any such article or commodity. It was amended by the Senate committee to strike out that language which I have just read and to substitute for it without too much thought apparently the language:

The fair retail price as fixed by the Price Administrator for such article or commodity wherever located.

I am sure that the author of that amendment, having had charge of the price-control bill in the Senate and having sat as chairman of the conference on the price-control matter, if it had been called to his attention that we were authorizing the Office of the Price Administrator to set a price instead of a ceiling, never would have approved this language, and if for no other reason at all than to prevent an agency of the Federal Government setting a price on commodities, the gentleman's amendment should be adopted.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that not only the Banking and Currency Committee that considered this bill but every Member of the House is sympathetic with the situation that the small businessman finds himself in today. I do not know of any one of the small business man group that has been hit any harder than the automobile and tire dealers. I hold in my hand a survey that was made in my district by some of the automobile dealers as to the situation that exists in my particular district. I believe this survey would represent conditions in the average congressional district.

Of the questionnaires that were sent out to ascertain the condition of these local dealers, there were 47 communities that answered and 131 different automobile dealers that answered these questionnaires. I want to particularize for the benefit of the Price Administrator and the House the situation that exists in one town of Minnesota, Mankato, in my district, which is a town of approximately 19,000 population.

In that town there are 12 automobile dealers. Nine out of the twelve of them answered the questionnaire. These 9 dealers had on hand at the time this questionnaire was sent out in January 261 cars and trucks. I would estimate that in that 1 town there are between

350 and 360 new cars and trucks, and I mean new cars and trucks and demonstrators. The pay roll of the 9 of the 12 dealers for the year 1941 was practically \$257,000. On October 1, 1941, they were employing 174 people in the 9 of the 12 dealers. On January 30, 1942, the employees had dropped from 174 to 114, and I presume that the drop in employment between that date and today is greater.

In these questionnaires that were sent out it was estimated that 90 percent of those auto dealers who answered stated that they would have to go out of business, assuming this rationing program would be continued. That is, these automobile dealers would have to close their doors and go out of business completely.

This bill perhaps is of some help. Personally, I do not believe it anywhere near answers the problem. There is one thing this Congress cannot do and Mr. Henderson cannot do, and that is to stop the depreciation upon the tires, trucks, and cars. They are going to depreciate, and 12 months from now many of the tires upon those cars will begin to disintegrate. You will find that mechanical depreciation applies to some limited extent on the cars and trucks.

I say that the answer to the problem is to make some reasonable disposition of these cars. Either put them in a Government pool or put them partly in a Government pool and partly in a dealer pool. Get them out of the hands of these dealers who are taking the depreciation.

Mr. Chairman, 5 months have elapsed since the freezing order was made. I made some investigation shortly after the freezing order went into effect, and I was both assured and hopeful that some further and other comprehensive and sensible plan would be offered to permit these dealers to make disposition of the cars on hand. I am frank to say that if anything expeditious is to be done it is going to have to come from the Congress. We all want to do what is right in the present drastic situation; we want to cooperate with our Government in its war effort; we want to protect and provide our Government with the cars and trucks that it needs in the war effort; but it is imperative that we also must take into consideration the importance of dealing fairly, justly, and quickly with those dealers who have everything they possess tied up in their automobiles and in their tire stocks, which they are largely prevented from selling and disposing of by the freezing order of January 1, 1942. The tires and cars are meanwhile depreciating; the dealers' rents, taxes, and overhead continue; and while this bill is a little help, I have no false delusion that it is anywhere near the answer to either the problem of the small business man and auto and tire dealer or to the Government or to the public as well.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to call the attention of the gentleman from Michigan to the language of the price-control law. The original legislation proposed used the word "ceiling" and provided for the establishment of ceilings; but the

language finally embodied in the bill which became law authorized the establishment of "maximum prices." So that the provision of the existing bill to which the amendment is directed using the word "price" is undoubtedly the proper language.

Mr. CHAIRMAN, there is a widespread recognition of reference to the necessity for this legislation, and it is important that it be not delayed. The Price Administration made known to the Committee on Banking and Currency that the officials of that administration recognize the justice of this measure. It is demanded in fairness to the automobile dealers of the Nation and to others who may find themselves facing like difficulties and problems.

Mr. THOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. THOM. In case the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, under this bill, purchases the cars of a dealer, is it the intention to continue to store those cars in the garage of the former owner?

Mr. STEAGALL. It is expected these cars will remain stored where they are in the hands of the dealers. It is also expected that only a part of supplies on hand now will be financed under the provisions of this bill. There are other methods being employed in efforts to solve this problem. It is not expected that all of the automobiles of the country will be taken over under the provisions of this bill. Many of them will remain where they are and will be fed into the market because the effect of restrictions will not continue as it has up to this time. May I express the hope that this bill be passed without amendment, that its final enactment be expedited?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. May I ask the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency if he can state to the House whether or not the Office of Price Administration wants this bill in its present form?

Mr. STEAGALL. I had assumed the gentleman was present when an official of the Price Administration testified before the Committee on Banking and Currency and gave endorsement to this bill. His name is Mr. Potter, and he represents the industrial branch of the Price Administration organization.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. KEAN. I did not so understand. I listened to that testimony, and in my opinion, they were opposed to this provision of the measure.

Mr. STEAGALL. The gentleman is entirely mistaken.

Mr. KEAN. I think the gentleman is entirely mistaken. I have talked to some of them on the telephone since.

Mr. STEAGALL. I cannot say about what was said to the gentleman over the telephone, but I called the Price Administration and asked them to send down a man who was familiar with this branch

of the service. They sent down Mr. Potter, who handles the industrial relationships of that organization. That is what he stated to our committee.

Mr. KEAN. They stated they were in favor of the principle of the bill to aid the automobile dealers.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KEAN) there were—ayes 29, noes 85.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BARDEN Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 2315) for the relief of dealers in certain articles or commodities rationed under authority of the United States, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 6995) was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to extend their remarks in the Record on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein an article from the Washington Times-Herald entitled "The Headache Boys and General MacArthur."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

SUSPENSION OF ANNUAL ASSESSMENT WORK ON CERTAIN MINING CLAIMS

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 6604) providing for the suspension of annual assessment work on mining claims held by location in the United States, including the Territory of Alaska, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 11, strike out all after "corporation" down to and including "corporation" in line 17.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I do not intend to object, will the gentleman be kind enough to tell the House just what the significance of the Senate amendment is?

Mr. O'CONNOR. In answer to the gentleman's question, I may say that the Senate struck out the limitation provided in the House bill in the following language:

And provided further, That such suspension of assessment work shall not apply to more than 6 placer-mining claims not to exceed 120 acres (in all) held by the same person, nor to more than 12 placer-mining claims not to exceed 240 acres (in all) held by the same partnership, association, or corporation.

The Senate eliminated that language by the amendment it adopted yesterday, and passed the bill as amended.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope the House adopts the Senate amendment, inasmuch as in my opinion the provisions of the House bill were not wise to begin with. They were placed in there by the committee somewhat in the manner of a compromise, because one of the departments was opposed to the bill. In my opinion, to place any limitation on the placer-mining claims would possibly forestall the development of some claims and some mineral deposits that would be very valuable to the Nation in this crisis. In other words, the topography of the country in various sections differs so that in some places one or two claims would be sufficient to carry on an adequate development while in other places a large number of claims might be necessary. I fully agree with the Senate amendment.

Mr. O'CONNOR. May I add to what the gentleman has said that placer-mining involves the mining of very low-grade ore, sometimes as low as 15 to 25 cents per yard, and requires considerable space upon which to operate. A placer-mining claim embraces 20 acres, to be exact. I, of course, favor the bill that I presented to the Committee on Mines and Mining, and I would have preferred to have the bill passed as it passed the House with that restriction. After all, though, legislation is usually the result of a compromise.

I feel confident, after talking with the distinguished member of the Senate from one of the Western States concerning the amendment which the Senate wrote into my bill that it would be very difficult, if not impossible, to have the members of the Committee on Mines and Mining of the Senate recede from their position and consequently I am constrained to accept the amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. STRATTON] be per-

mitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a brief editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I further ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a brief editorial in regard to General Grant, a citizen of my home town.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a very brief article from the Hastings Daily Tribune, of Hastings, Nebr.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. NICHOLS) be permitted to extend his remarks twice in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and to include therein two letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter from the Kerrhard Co., of Red Oak, Iowa.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. DICKSTEIN) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, we all know that we are in a war that is not a push-over. In order to win this war we must, all of us, drive one way, the American way, to bring about success in the final analysis. In order to do this, Mr. Speaker, we must have unity among ourselves, not only in the Congress of the United States, which has so splendidly shown a united front since Pearl Harbor, but we also must have such cooperation from the American people in every section of the country.

I regret to say that this unity in certain sections is not what we have a right to expect, because of racial intolerance which is becoming a grave danger. This intolerance is being fostered by certain groups that are seeking to destroy this country of ours, by creating disunity and discord among our people. In certain sections and communities of the country they have publications which spread vicious defeatist propaganda designed to undermine the peoples' faith in and support of our Government's war efforts. Such publications are financed by various subversive groups.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot have any unity if this is to continue and we must waken all of our people to the fact that unity is essential to success in this war.

In certain sections that I have visited you still have agents of nazi-ism and fascism, and I can name a number of States and a number of communities where this is true. In time of war we should give a blank check to the Attorney General, Francis Biddle, and a blank check to the Department of Justice and the Secret Service and the Intelligence Service of both the Army and the Navy to ferret out these so-called subversive groups and stop the publication of a number of little periodicals which spread poison and promote a spirit of intolerance among our people throughout the country.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that the men who died at Pearl Harbor, Bataan, Wake Island, and Guam, if they were alive today to tell the story, would make the same appeal to the American people that I am hoping to make today.

To illustrate my point further, a number of times I have called the attention of this House to certain subversive groups which, unfortunately, the Dies committee did not see fit to study or investigate. I will name one of them. We have a so-called Count Vonsiatsky, who is married to money and has an estate in Thompson, Conn., and he has an organized group to do what? Theoretically—to overthrow the present Russian regime. Practically, however, he has become the liaison officer of native and foreign Fascists and his house is a meeting place for Fascist groups. His organization has spread to all sections of the country and only recently have I discovered that he is registered as a foreign agent.

There are a number of Vonsiatskys who are registered as foreign agents to spread their philosophy of destruction, whether it is against the United States or some of our allies. This should not be allowed and in time of war registration is not enough. In time of war we should put a stop to all of these foreign organizations no matter how innocent their purposes may appear to be, with respect to advocating something that is foreign to the principles of the American people. We should stop this kind of propaganda whether registered or not. You can go down to the little place of Yorkville, in my city, and when you reach about Seventy-fifth or Eightieth Street it begins to smell of nazi-ism. The Department of Justice only recently acting on some information they had went into a number of homes and, sure enough, they were celebrating Hitler's birthday. They found ammunition and they found every kind of propaganda that is poisonous to the American people. You can go down to some portions of New Jersey and you will find groups and flocks of so-called Nazi sympathizers who are ready, if they have the opportunity, to destroy us, and I venture to say here and now that if and when the time comes and we happen to strike at Germany from offensive positions, you will get more sabotage in this country than you

would expect because we have taken too many things for granted. I remember, going back to 1934, under the McCormack committee, we had the thing under control. I remember that my good friend and colleague, U. S. GUYER, was a member of that committee, but we could not then awaken the American people to the dangers that have been pursuing us since 1933, when Hitler took command of the German people.

Believe me when I tell you that I stood on this floor and named at least 5,000 subversive groups and individuals, and I venture to say not one of these groups, or more than one-half percent of them, have ever been investigated by the so-called Dies committee. This is no time for tommyrot or pussyfooting. This is war, and we in Congress ought to make it our business to give more aid to our Attorney General and give more power, if necessary, to the Department of Justice to destroy these elements throughout the country.

Another observation I make, Mr. Speaker. You take some groups and in their hearts they are Fascists and against this Government. They organize themselves into a so-called mushroom newspaper in a community and then go down to the post office and make application for second-class mail privilege. When it is found out that the organization is against our form of government, or our Army and Navy, then, when we come to look for the individual at the top, we cannot find him. It is my strong recommendation that during the war period all so-called mushroom tabloids throughout the country that are in control of irresponsible groups of people, who in that way at the command of the Nazi Government spread this propaganda, should be stopped. I recall, Mr. Speaker, about 3 or 4 years ago I came across some correspondence between a Fascist group or a Nazi group and the Remington Arms & Ammunition Co. I tried to locate my file which contains evidence that the Nazis were negotiating for ammunition and arms for their organizations in this country. I venture to say that if a proper investigation were made by any committee of certain interwoven interests of the German Government in this country, we would expose facts that would startle the American people.

The law that we are now working on, which was the first bill passed by the McCormack committee to register foreign agents with the State Department, is all right, but it is my best judgment that during the time of war we ought to disband such organizations and stop them from advocating any foreign philosophy which we know is not for the best interests of the American people. Go down the line and you will find a number of great big industries that have received millions and billions of dollars in war work and defense work, but that are still discriminating against certain groups of people in this country, be they white or black. Go through some of our industries, and I have an idea of one or two where the contract is cost-plus, and you will find men there sitting back who

are told not to work so hard. What kind of a citizen would tell any worker that he is working too hard at a time when the United States needs so much material for the defense of ourselves and our Allies? On the other hand, we have certain groups, professional pay-roll guys, who advocate a division between the Soviet Union and this country because they do not like the form of government there. Take your own Dies committee—and I am not making any personal aspersions, but as I said in the early part of the day, while having great respect for that committee, yet it has outworn its usefulness, it is an old coat, an old suit, and we ought to change the style. Attacking the Soviet Union at this time is not for the best interests of our people. I do not believe in their form of government. They can keep that form of government over there, but Russia is one of the best Allies that this country ever had, and by all means she should be supplied with the best lease-lend material, because they are doing a swell job. If you have followed the history of this war, you will know that they are already drafting boys and girls in Germany at the age of 11 and 12 years, and you will find that much of the manpower of the German Government has been absolutely wiped out by the Russian Army and the other Allies. By all means Russia is a great Ally, and we should not as Members of Congress or as a congressional committee attack Russia, because she is doing a real human job.

Mr. Speaker, going back to my discussion of subversive publications, I believe that more of these publications ought to be removed from our mails. Because of my investigation over a number of years I have found that people who get a second-class permit for mailing purposes through our post offices are indirectly the so-called subversive groups, delivering this mail which is nothing but propaganda against the democracies. I think during the time of war the mail should be gone over more carefully. I do not think the freedom that the mail has had during peacetime should apply during wartime. At least, the people who ship out publications ought to be people of responsibility who should be able to go before the postmaster and present their case and show that they are legitimate American organizations and that their activity is not adverse to the interest of the United States.

Yes; there is much to be done. But so far it has not been done. Sometime ago the House passed a bill to give the Attorney General power to cancel the citizenship papers of certain professional Nazis and Fascists who only obtained those papers for the purpose of protecting their own skins. That was a bill in the right direction. I am sure it is not going to be abused. I was asked about it a number of times, as to whether the Attorney General would pick up innocent people. I am not disturbed about picking up innocent people, because that is not the intention of the Attorney General or of the United States.

There are certain people that we can name who have obtained their certificates of citizenship, who came here for

the sole purpose of furthering the program of Hitler, to divide us amongst ourselves. Let us wake up. Let us put a stop to this peacetime freedom that should have been curtailed long ago.

Now, it seems to me also, Mr. Speaker, that we should be more friendly with each other. We are all in the same boat. This war must be fought by all of us, with a better spirit among the American people, because all Americans are equal. We might get a better sale of bonds and stamps if that were true, because too many people are being discriminated against in one form or another and unable to earn the money with which to purchase bonds and stamps. I know of numbers of cases where that is so. Out of curiosity I issued letters of introduction to some constituents who happen to be outstanding Americans of my faith. When they applied for jobs, the first question fired at them was, "What is your religion?" The second statement was, "We have no room for you." Those are men who were born here; men whose children are fighting in this present war and some of whom fought in the last war. I have known of many cases where colored people were deprived of employment because of their race and, what is even more disgraceful, were discriminated against while wearing the uniform of the armed forces of our country.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHEPARD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, as I stated at the beginning of my discussion, I hoped to give some more attention to the question of subversive publications and what they are doing to this country.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES

Some of them appear innocent enough and merely advocate governmental changes, which might be subversive, but cannot be considered treasonable. However, the line of demarcation between what is subversive and what is treasonable has grown dimmer from day to day. In view of the necessity of making our war effort all-embracing and laying aside all activities which do not promote our war effort, it is necessary to brand such publications with the strongest condemnation possible.

Treason is a crime of such horrible nature that the fathers of our country saw fit to insert into the Constitution of the United States, the following words: "Treason against the United States shall consist only in levying war against them, or in adhering to their enemies, giving them aid and comfort."—Article III, section 3.

Judged by this standard, which is a part of the fundamental law of the land, Social Justice and other such publications definitely deserve to be labeled traitorous, and I hereby charge them with treason to the United States, by reason of their giving aid and comfort to the enemies of this Nation.

Many years ago the Supreme Court of the United States was called upon to con-

strue the meaning of the treason clause of our Constitution. At the time the Supreme Court made its early decisions, a war was usually conducted in a punctilious manner and antagonists were fighting on fair terms with one another. Such, however, is no longer the case; at present wars are steeped in totalitarian fashion, and before actual conflict there are many ways in which the enemy can "soften up" a nation by creating a fifth column.

The Hitler method of fighting consists of first dividing a country against itself, breaking up its power of resistance, spreading panic and then machine gunning and bombing from the air until a nation finds itself incapable of offering resistance, and is crushed completely, before attaining a chance to fight.

Hitler and Hirohito have been conducting a war against us by the organization of fifth columns under various names, which have created on our soil, both moral and material propaganda, and which are destroying our power of defense by fair means or foul.

Our Monroe Doctrine was violated by the enemies of our Nation who are seeking, by any means, to establish a foothold on South America, and thereby obtain a base for an attack on the Western Hemisphere.

The activities of Social Justice and the other publications, closely parallel these ideas which attempt to cause division among our ranks and to give aid and comfort to the enemies. Before this country became involved in war with Japan and Germany there was the attitude of men like Coughlin, Pelley, Gerald K. Smith, Winrod, and others, that we should concentrate on our defense, should give no attention or consideration to the distressed democracies, keep our fleet at home and get along without an army since it was unnecessary and no one had made hostile movements against the United States.

After Pearl Harbor this faction did not change in the slightest. They still contended that we had no business fighting, unless our country was invaded, and though Pearl Harbor was attacked and though Pearl Harbor is part of our territory, it is too remote, in their opinion, to be of any concern to us. After all, why should we defend the Hawaiian Islands, they ask; they only became part of the United States, at the close of the last century. Why should we defend the Philippines, are they not far away in the Pacific Ocean? And also there will be no need of defending Alaska because we only acquired it some 70 years ago, and if Japan should invade the west coast, we may retire to the East, and should the Germans invade the East we could retire to the West. Likewise, if we are invaded on both coasts why we could stick our heads in the sands of Arizona, like an ostrich, closing our eyes to all dangers and taking a position like Candide, feeling that no one can harm us.

These publishers have become the living voices of Dr. Goebbels; in fact, if one reads Social Justice, particularly its articles published in the last few months, one is forcefully reminded of the out-

pourings of the German Minister of Propaganda. You find there the same accusations that Goebbels preached for 14 years against the stupidity of the democracies, the troubles the world is put to because of the Jews, and that all the misfortunes of the world are due to the Jewish race. Such is the tenor of all the articles which appear in Social Justice, and the final claim was made very recently to the effect that Germany declared war on Poland and the rest of Europe because Samuel Untermyer started to boycott German goods in 1933. For both stupidity and malicious thoughts the articles of Social Justice and other magazines of the same class stand unique. Strange as it may seem, there are many people in this country who are properly taken in, just as there were many people in Germany who followed the line of Goebbels when he claimed that Jews were bad for the country.

Although it was necessary for me to enlist among the subversive publishers the name of Father Coughlin, I want it understood that I have the highest regard for the Catholic Church, to which many of my constituents belong, and I do not consider Father Coughlin as being in any way representative of Catholic preaching, either generally or specifically. As a matter of fact, anyone familiar with the utterances of Pope Pius XI and Pope Pius XII will clearly see that antisemitism is not one of the practices of the Catholic Church. When Mussolini started to play at the anti-semitic game of Hitler and Goebbels, he was severely rebuked by the Pope in that he was disregarding the principles of the Catholic Church.

On April 3, 1942, the following statement by Monsignor Hickey clearly repudiated, on behalf of the Detroit archdiocese, Father Coughlin's activities and clearly disavowed any connection of the Catholic Church with Father Coughlin's sheet:

[From the New York Times of April 3, 1942]

The Catholic Archdiocese of Detroit disavowed today any connection with the magazine Social Justice, founded by the Reverend Charles E. Coughlin, Royal Oak radio priest.

The archdiocese assumes no responsibility for the magazine directly or indirectly, according to a statement by the Right Reverend Edward J. Hickey, chancellor of the archdiocese.

Monsignor Hickey's statement was included in an editorial which appeared today in the Michigan Catholic. It was headed "An authoritative confirmation," and declared:

"Current controversy on the editorial policy of the local weekly, Social Justice, in relation to American morale, has brought from some Catholic papers in the country the emphatic statement that Social Justice is not a Catholic paper. We had thought that this was clear to all our readers.

"The receipt of some inquiries, however, has led us to ask the archdiocesan chancery for authoritative confirmation on this point. From the reply of Msgr. Edward J. Hickey, chancellor of the archdiocese of Detroit, we quote the following:

"A Catholic paper is, by definition, one that is published under the supervision of proper church authority. Social Justice is not under such supervision and is, therefore, not a Catholic paper. Moreover, for nearly

2 years back—since Father Coughlin's latest withdrawal from responsibility for Social Justice with the issue of May 27, 1940—no priest of this diocese has asked or received permission to contribute to Social Justice and no priest of this diocese has been authorized to associate himself in any capacity with its publication or circulation, or, to the knowledge of this office, has actually done so. In a word, the archdiocese of Detroit has no responsibility direct or indirect for Social Justice magazine."

Social Justice magazine is published in Royal Oak and according to a statement issued some time ago by Father Coughlin, is owned by his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Thomas J. Coughlin.

It was one of the leading isolationist publications in the country prior to December 7, 1941. Since the United States entered the war it has been charged by Catholic and secular papers with being variously anti-British, anti-Roosevelt, anti-Jewish, anti-Russian, and obstructionist.

I call further attention to the fact that in the New York Times of March 30, 1942, the following editorial appeared, quoting the Florida Catholic, a religious weekly published in St. Augustine, which is the oldest Catholic diocese in the United States:

The last issue of the Florida Catholic, a religious weekly published in St. Augustine, oldest Episcopal seat in the United States, contains a blistering denunciation of the "disloyal activities" of "that un-American paper misnamed Social Justice." The Florida Catholic does not mince words in expressing its opinion in this country, but the fact that it was founded by Father Coughlin and sold at the doors of some churches on Sunday makes useful and timely the indignant repudiation of the church and of Catholic journalism by a weekly which is the diocesan organ of Bishop Joseph P. Hurley, until 1940 an official of the secretariat of state of the Vatican.

"Social Justice is not a Catholic paper," the editorial asserts. "It does not reflect Catholic views. It does not acknowledge or obey any Catholic authority. Indeed, it has on various occasions made bitter attack on those authorities. Despite its mock concern for the welfare of our country, despite its peculiar brand of piety, this magazine is both unpatriotic and un-Christian."

In the April 13 issue of Life magazine an article was published entitled "Voices of Defeat." In this article attention is called to the fact that this country abounds in a large number of publications which, while not treasonable, are certainly seditious.

I have no desire to bore you by citing further the names of all the organizations or publications which have been spreading this doctrine of sedition, but let me tell you about a few of them. In Chicago apparently there are a number of organizations which seek to organize our national strength with the idea of thwarting our war effort and conducting anti-American propaganda of all kinds.

One such organization, We the Mothers, Mobilize for America, Inc., claims a membership of 15,000 in 32 States. This organization apparently is organized to impeach the President and to appease Japan on the theory that the Japanese are reasonable people and would surely make a deal with the United States.

Another Chicago organization is called the Citizens Committee, which also seeks to appease our enemies and to reach an agreement with Japan and Germany.

Their publications have been circulated among the Members of Congress as well as other men in public life and the American people generally, and have been distributed under many names. We have, for instance, The Defender, by Gerald B. Winrod, Publicity by E. F. Garner, The Galilean by Pelley, now most fortunately out of publication, and The Cross and the Flag, by Gerald L. K. Smith, and many others.

I had occasion at one time or another to call attention of the House to these publications and their publishers. Public opinion has finally been aroused. I wish to commend the stand taken by the Attorney General in stamping out this menace to our war effort. I feel that such efforts on the part of the Attorney General will cut out this cancerous growth, which is a menace to our country, and I believe that only courageous treatment of this problem by Congress will bring about a sensible solution of this vexing question.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot afford to be complacent. This is a question of self-preservation. We must expose people and publications that play into Hitler's hands by using Goebbels' methods to create disunity, distrust, and unrest among our people. Only if we are united can we win this war, and we must win it to preserve our heritage as a democratic nation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include certain correspondence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

A NATIONAL VETERANS' CEMETERY SHOULD BE PROVIDED AT ONCE FOR THE NORTH PACIFIC COAST AREA

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, as many of my colleagues will recall, I have been urging for a long time the construction of a national veterans' cemetery by the United States in or near Portland, Oreg., to provide burial facilities for deceased veterans in this great Northwest area. The time has now come making it absolutely necessary that plans be devised and definite action taken for the immediate construction of this cemetery; otherwise there will be no burial facilities in a nationally owned and maintained cemetery available for the burial of deceased veterans in this large area.

I introduced H. R. 950, a companion bill to S. 793, which was passed by this House and is now Public Law No. 388, Seventy-seventh Congress. Under this law the Secretary of War is directed to acquire a site and construct a national veterans' cemetery in the vicinity of Portland, Oreg.

After the approval of this law and on February 21, 1942, I wrote the following letter to the Secretary of War:

I enclose herewith Public Law No. 388, Seventy-seventh Congress, recently passed by the Congress, authorizing you as Secretary of

War to establish and maintain, in accordance with the provisions of law governing national cemeteries, a national cemetery in the vicinity of Portland, Oreg. I also enclose statement made by me which gives some detailed information showing the imperative need of early establishment of burial facilities for deceased veterans in the Northwest area of the United States.

As disclosed by this information and as you no doubt know, there are totally inadequate burial facilities in that area, and with the casualties of the war in which we are now engaged this emergency will only be increased. The veterans in that district are greatly concerned over the gravity of the situation and are urging that immediate steps be taken to establish the cemetery under the provisions of this act.

I will appreciate it if you will advise me of the expense which would be involved in the undertaking and if it is not possible to proceed at once with the establishment of the cemetery. If for any reason the establishment of the cemetery cannot be undertaken now, I will be glad if you will advise me of the steps to be taken to obviate the difficulties.

On February 19 I addressed an inquiry to the Secretary of War requesting information as to burial space available for veterans in this Northwest area under Federal control, and under date of March 3 he advised me as follows:

Reference is made to your letter of February 19, 1942, in which you state that burial facilities for veterans in the Northwest area of the United States are inadequate for present needs, and request a statement as to what funds are required to carry out the mandate of Public Law No. 388, Seventy-seventh Congress.

The nearest burial space now available for deceased veterans of the Portland, Oreg., area is in the Custer Battlefield National Cemetery, which is within a few miles of Crow Agency, Mont., approximately 700 miles by rail from Portland. The next nearest burial facilities are in the Golden Gate National Cemetery, San Bruno, Calif., approximately 755 miles by rail from Portland.

It is realized that the distances involved would make the interment of the remains of Oregon veterans an expensive proposition for their families, and particularly so if the members of the families desired to accompany the remains and be present at the interment. On the other hand, the establishment of a national cemetery in the vicinity of Portland would cost approximately \$200,000 for land, development, and improvements thereto.

Mr. Speaker, as shown by this letter from the Secretary of War, the nearest national veterans' cemetery to Portland is now 700 miles, which means that from other portions of the territory the distance is from 1,000 to 1,500 miles, and particularly the Territory of Alaska. This cemetery would give burial facilities for veterans from the States of Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and parts of Montana, and the Territory of Alaska, in which there are at the present time approximately 155,000 veterans of the various wars, as shown by the following tabulation:

There are in the State of Oregon 41,219 World War veterans, 41 Civil War veterans, 47 Indian war veterans, 2,673 Spanish-American War veterans, and 398 peacetime veterans. In the State of Washington there are 64,999 World War veterans, 46 Civil War veterans, 65 Indian war veterans, 4,169 Spanish-American War veterans, and 747 peacetime veterans. Idaho has 15,457 World War veterans, 11 Civil War veterans, 19 Indian

war veterans, 672 Spanish-American War veterans, and 103 peacetime veterans. Montana has 20,610 World War veterans, 5 Civil War veterans, 75 Indian war veterans, 892 Spanish-American War veterans, and 148 peacetime veterans. The figures for Alaska are a total of 2,500. In the above States there are a total of 142,285 World War veterans, 103 Civil War veterans, 206 Indian war veterans, 8,406 Spanish-American War veterans, and 1,396 peacetime veterans. The total number of veterans in the above Territory is 154,896.

The average age of the World War veterans is 48, Spanish-American War veterans, 66; Civil War, 96; Indian war, 81. It is estimated that a total of 103 World War veterans die each day, Spanish-American War veterans at the rate of 24 a day; Civil War, 3 a day; and Indian war 1 a day. These figures are the 1940 rate. There are approximately 4,000,000 World War veterans surviving, 159,230 Spanish-American War veterans, 2,381 Civil War veterans, and 2,216 Indian war veterans. In applying the death rate proportionately to the number of World War, Spanish, Indian, and Civil War veterans residing in Oregon, Washington, Idaho, and Montana, there are approximately 4 $\frac{2}{3}$ deaths per day. This figure does not take into consideration the peacetime veterans or officers and enlisted men of the Army and Navy, since mortality figures covering these groups are not available.

Most of the remains of deceased veterans in the above-mentioned States would only have to be transported within a radius of 400 to 500 miles to this Portland cemetery, with the exception of Alaska, which is some 1,200 miles away. At the present time, if a veteran wishes to be buried in a national cemetery, his body must be sent to San Francisco, which would be a distance of from 1,000 to 1,500 miles, or even further from Alaska.

We also have in this northwest area four veterans' hospitals, besides the one at Portland—one at Walla Walla, Wash., 248 miles from Portland; Boise, Idaho, 479 miles from Portland; Roseburg, Oreg., 196 miles from Portland; and a new Army hospital located at Vancouver, Wash., 8 miles from Portland.

Another factor that must be taken into consideration is there have now been established numerous Army and Navy camps in the Northwest in carrying out our war effort. There are pursuit bases established at the following locations in the Northwest: Portland Columbia Airport, McChord Field at Tacoma, Pendleton, Spokane, a large munitions dump at Hermiston, Army camps at Fort Stevens, Camp Clatsop, Camp Murray, Camp Lewis, Navy stations at Tongue Point at the mouth of the Columbia River, and a large Navy and Coast Guard personnel located in the Puget Sound area. The approximate number of Army and Navy personnel today serving in the armed forces of the United States from these States and Alaska would run well over an additional—I am not allowed to give the number by reasons of national safety—men who in case of death would be entitled to burial in a national cemetery.

Mr. Speaker, our soldiers, sailors and marines are fighting on many battlefronts throughout the world. Unfortunately many of them already have paid

the supreme sacrifice and placed their lives on the altar in the defense of our country. Their broken bodies will soon be coming back to their homes to find a final resting place in the soil from which they sprung. The least that a grateful nation can do in commemoration of the heroic service of these brave men and women is to accord them decent burial in the vicinity of their homes where their relatives and friends may participate in the final service.

There are no facilities now available in the Northwest for burial of deceased veterans in a cemetery maintained and operated by the Federal Government. It is as much a part of our war effort to provide burial facilities for the casualties of the war as it is to provide food, care, and protection for them while they are fighting for the defense of our country. A grateful nation can do no less than make provision for the care of our dead who have given their lives that the rest of us might live.

Recently, at my request, Col. Charles C. Reynolds, of the Quartermaster's Department, inspected the proposed site for this cemetery at Portland, and I am informed found it to be admirably situated and in every way suitable for a national cemetery and available for the purpose.

I urge, Mr. Speaker, that immediate steps be taken to acquire the site and that the plans for the cemetery be completed without delay so that actual construction work may be done at an early date, to the end that burial facilities will be available in this Northwest territory for those who are giving their lives in the national service at this critical time of our history.

Mr. Speaker, in order to provide the necessary funds to carry out the purposes of Public Law No. 388, I introduced H. R. 6570, which appropriates \$200,000, which should have the approval of this body and be enacted into law at once as a war measure, so that these burial facilities may be made available at the earliest possible date. I urge and hope that the Appropriations Committee of the House will give early consideration to this bill and report it out with approval for early passage.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include therein resolutions from a group of my constituents.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. STARNES of Alabama (at the request of Mr. SPARKMAN), on account of official business.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 244. An act for the relief of the San Francisco Mountain Scenic Boulevard Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 506. An act to limit the time within which the General Accounting Office shall make final settlement of the monthly or quarterly accounts of disbursing officers under the executive branch of the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

S. 2109. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to sell and convey to the town of Marmet, W. Va., two tracts of land to be used for municipal purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 2190. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marilla C. Gray; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2292. An act for the relief of Vernon E. Deus; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2368. An act to amend the joint resolution approved August 27, 1940 (54 Stat. 858), as amended, and the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 835), as amended, so as to remove the requirement that medical statements shall be furnished to those persons performing military service thereunder; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 2422. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to designate the titles of certain offices and departments of instruction at the United States Military Academy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 2427. An act to amend the act relating to preventing the publication of inventions in the national interest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Patents.

S. 2451. An act for the relief of Anthony W. Livingston; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2469. An act for the relief of William Edward Fleming; to the Committee on Claims.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2320. An act to accept the cession by the States of North Carolina and Tennessee of exclusive jurisdiction over the lands embraced within the Great Smoky Mountains National Park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5075. An act to create a Recreation Board for the District of Columbia, to define its duties, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6799. An act to increase the monthly maximum number of flying hours of air pilots, as limited by the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, because of the military needs arising out of the present war.

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1765. An act for the relief of the minor children of Mrs. Jesus Zamora Felix, deceased; and

S. 2002. An act to amend Public Law No. 35, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved April 11, 1941.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2320. An act to accept the cession by the States of North Carolina and Tennessee of exclusive jurisdiction over the lands embraced within the Great Smoky Mountains National Park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5075. An act to create a Recreation Board for the District of Columbia, to define its duties, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6799. An act to increase the monthly maximum number of flying hours of air pilots, as limited by the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, because of the military needs arising out of the present war.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 29, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 3 of the Committee on the Judiciary will continue hearings on the following bills at 10 a. m., April 28 and May 1, 1942, room 346, House Office Building:

H. R. 5218, to confer jurisdiction on the United States courts in cases involving work stoppages, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5259 and H. R. 6752, to confer jurisdiction in the United States courts in cases involving work stoppage for illegitimate and nonlabor purposes; and

H. R. 6872, to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against interference by violence, threats, coercion, or intimidation," approved June 18, 1934.

The Special Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and Reorganization of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 6840, to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto (railroad adjustments), at 10:30 a. m. on Wednesday, April 29, room 346, House Office Building.

MEETING OF IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION COMMITTEE

A meeting of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation will be held at 10:30 o'clock Wednesday, April 29, room 353, House Office Building, for the purpose of considering H. R. 6522. It will be an executive session.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Tuesday, May 5, 1942.

Business to be considered: The hearing in connection with the Federal Communications Commission will be resumed on May 5 at 10 a. m.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Tuesday, May 5, 1942, at 10 a. m., on Senate Joint Resolution 130, to extend and amend certain emergency laws relating to the merchant marine, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1600. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the use of appropriations for

travel and transportation for the transportation of dependents of officers and employees of Government agencies from zones of military operation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1601. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the construction or acquisition of additional naval aircraft, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

1602. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a recommendation for disposal by certain agencies of the Federal Government of useless executive papers; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1603. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated June 18, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a preliminary examination and survey of the Six Mile Creek in Logan County, Ark., authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on June 28, 1938 (H. Doc. No. 717); to the Committee on Flood Control and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. H. R. 475. A bill to provide for the expenses of the Special Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities; without amendment (Rept. No. 2053). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 6995. A bill for the relief of dealers in certain articles or commodities rationed under authority of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 2055). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Revision of the Laws. H. R. 4280. A bill to codify title I of the United States Code; without amendment (Rept. No. 2056). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DONDERO: Committee on Rivers and Harbors. House Joint Resolution 294. Joint resolution instructing the Secretary of War to henceforth designate the new lock in the St. Marys River at Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., as the General Douglas MacArthur lock; without amendment (Rept. No. 2057). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. NICHOLS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 125. Resolution creating a Select Committee to Investigate Air Accidents; without amendment (Rept. No. 2058). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. NICHOLS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 125. Resolution creating a Select Committee to Investigate Air Accidents; without amendment (Rept. No. 2059). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RAMSAY: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 6843. A bill for the relief of Dr. Manfred Sakel; without amendment (Rept. No. 2054). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 7006. A bill to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941 (Public Law No. 8, 77th Cong., 1st sess.), as amended by section 10 of the act entitled "An act to amend and clarify certain acts pertaining to the Coast Guard, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1941 (Public Law No. 166, 77th Cong., 1st sess.); to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 7007. A bill to authorize the construction or acquisition of additional naval aircraft, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. STEAGALL:

H. R. 7008. A bill to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to issue notes, bonds, and debentures in the sum of \$5,000,000,000 in excess of existing authority; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 7009. A bill to facilitate the prosecution of the war by providing for Federal regulation of sizes and weights of motor vehicles operating on certain highways; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'LEARY:

H. R. 7010 (by request). A bill to facilitate and simplify collection procedure in the Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

H. R. 7011 (by request). A bill to provide for a Deputy Federal Works Administrator and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. KEEFE:

H. J. Res. 307. Joint resolution designating June 13, 1942, as Douglas MacArthur Day, and authorizing its appropriate observance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri:

H. J. Res. 308. Joint resolution making appropriations to provide war housing and war public works in and near the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. COCHRAN:

H. Res. 475. Resolution to provide for the expenses of the Special Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities; to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BONNER:

H. R. 7012. A bill for the relief of Litchfield brothers, of Aurora, N. C.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 7013. A bill for the relief of H. M. Reid & Co., of Macon, Ga.; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2725. By Mr. JARRETT: Petition of the members of Ebenezer United Presbyterian Church, of Centertown, Pa., favoring Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2726. Also, petition of senior high-school students, protesting against power-dam erection on Clarion River destroying Cocks Forest; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

2727. Also, petition of Anna G. Brennan and other signers, citizens of Sharon, Pa., oppos-

ing the Baldwin bill (H. R. 6806); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2728. Also, petition of sundry residents of Stoneboro, Pa., opposing the St. Lawrence seaway; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

2729. By Mr. JOHNSON of California: Resolution adopted by the Townsend Club, No. 1, of Bellflower, Calif., and signed by H. C. Vinacke, president, and Sarah Woolman, secretary, requesting that the Congress of the United States of America enact such law or laws as will prohibit the manufacturing, brewing, distilling, and sale of any and all alcoholic beverages at any time or place within the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2730. By Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY: Resolution of the Italian-American Labor Council of New York City, adopted on April 25, 1942, at its general council representing 200,000 American workers; to the Committee on Labor.

2731. By Mr. HILL of Washington: Petition of sundry citizens of Dayton, Wash.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2732. By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa: Petition of Rev. J. Lynn Pace, Independent Bible Church, and members of the local Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Columbus Junction, Iowa, urging the passage of Senate bill 860 as a contribution to a wholesome defense program and a reenactment of legislation similar to that of 1917 and so give to the young men of 1942 the protection their fathers had in 1917; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2733. By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts: Petition of Mary L. Sawyer and sundry residents of Mansfield, Mass., urging enactment of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2734. By Mr. REED of New York: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Scio, N. Y., favoring Senate Joint Resolution No. 21; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2735. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution No. 2567 of the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, relative to decentralization of Government departments and with particular reference to the Maritime Commission locating in San Francisco; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

2736. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Mrs. W. H. Corson, of Williamsport, Pa., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Senate bill 860, relative to the exploitation of the men in the Army and the Navy of the United States of America; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2737. Also, petitions of Ira G. Springman, of Montoursville, Pa., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Senate bill 860, relative to the exploitation of the men in the Army and Navy of the United States of America; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 29, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, the Reverend James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, for each new day we ask Thy presence and Thy benediction. Neither cast down by disappointments, nor elated by successes, we pray that we may possess our souls. Thou dost call the heavy-laden who sink beneath a load of sorrow, and they shall find rest to their souls, a peace, a calm,

a spirit of ease; in this strength is realized that love which is at the heart of all.

We pray that we may light our lamps at the flame of eternal truth that the highest good in the universe may come our human way. Blessed Lord God, in every walk of life we would enthrone Thee, whose name is Wonderful Counselor. Vitalize our service by revealing to us that nothing is foreign to our Father in heaven which is essential to man. Giving the cooling freshness of water in the chalice of love, feeding hunger-bitten lips, clothing wind-chilled bodies, these will unconsciously weave for the soul a robe of righteousness which will outshine the gold at sundown. "Inasmuch as ye did unto one of the least of these, My brethren, ye did it unto Me." In the name of our Elder Brother. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

BOARD OF VISITORS OF THE COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following resignation from the Board of Visitors of the Coast Guard Academy.

The Clerk read as follows:

APRIL 28, 1942.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,
*United States Capitol,
Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: As it will be impossible for me to attend the meeting of the Board of Visitors of the Coast Guard Academy at New London, Conn., on May 2, I suggest that you designate someone else to attend in my place.

Thanking you, I am

Cordially yours,

CLIFTON A. WOODRUM.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 38, Seventy-fifth Congress, as amended by Public Law 183, Seventy-sixth Congress, the Chair appoints as a member of the Board of Visitors to the Coast Guard Academy the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] to fill the vacancy thereon.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following communications:

APRIL 28, 1942.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,
*The Speaker,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.*

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Under date of January 7, 1942, pursuant to the act of April 16, 1937, as amended (Public, No. 38, 75th Cong., 1st sess.), I appointed certain members of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries to serve as members of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy for the calendar year 1942.

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN having declined to serve by reason of official business, I hereby appoint Hon. HENRY W. JACKSON in the place and stead of Hon. FRANK W. BOYKIN.

Yours very sincerely,

S. O. BLAND.

APRIL 29, 1942.

The Honorable SAM RAYBURN,
*Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.*

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I regret to advise that I shall be unable to attend the meeting at the Coast Guard Academy, New London,